

THE
SATURDAY REVIEW
OF
POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

No. 1,113, Vol. 43.

February 24, 1877.

[Registered for
Transmission abroad.]

Price 6d.

THE EASTERN QUESTION IN THE LORDS.

THE debate in the House of Lords on the Eastern question was more brilliant and more elevated in tone than the earlier discussion in the House of Commons, and perhaps it may indirectly promote some practical object; but the Duke of ARGYLL and Lord GRANVILLE shrink, like their allies in the House of Commons, from proposing in a definite form any alternative policy. The Duke of ARGYLL indeed asserted that the Government might choose among half-a-dozen different kinds of coercion; yet he declined to specify any one of the measures which he contemplated as possible, perhaps because he was unable to count on the support of his party. The Duke of ARGYLL's criticism on the conduct of the Ministers since the beginning of the insurrection was remarkably eloquent; but his candid admission that the country was, down to a late period, bound by the treaty of 1856, destroyed much of the effect of his argument. Lord DERBY's first error is supposed to have been the expression of his wish that the Porte would suppress the insurrection at the outset, and his remonstrance with the Austrian Government for permitting their public functionaries to aid the insurgents. Lord DERBY took the opportunity to give the answer which had long since suggested itself to impartial critics of his policy. At first he thought that the movement was hopeless, and that in its result it would only entail suffering on the Christian population. If the insurgents had been left to themselves, or if the Turkish Government had displayed ordinary vigour, his anticipations would have been realized. It was not unreasonable to remind the Austrian Government, while it was watching the disturbance with nervous anxiety, that its own servants and agents were co-operating with the malcontents. As the insurrection assumed larger proportions, it became evident that Servia and Montenegro were likely to appear as principals in a conflict which was already stimulated by Russia. If the Turks had obtained an early and decisive victory, the English Government would not have failed to urge on the Porte the necessity of improved administration and of clemency. The ANDRASSY Note might perhaps in that case have received the cordial support of the English Government, instead of its hesitating acquiescence. Lord BEACONSFIELD justly considered that an elaborate scheme of reform propounded in the midst of a civil war was inopportune and that it was destined to be abortive.

In estimating the conduct of the Government it is necessary to remember a remark made in the debate, as it has often been made before, that English statesmen live in a house of glass, where foreign friends and enemies can, without liability to reciprocal supervision, watch all their movements. If the foreign policy of Russia, of Austria, and of Germany had been exposed to such public comments as those of the Duke of ARGYLL and Mr. GLADSTONE, it might perhaps have been found that the English Government was not exceptionally subject to the charge of vacillation and inconsistency. The Governments which have at different times most earnestly professed to desire that their action should be concerted with England began their diplomatic operations by an ostentatious, if not offensive, advertisement of the exclusive understanding which was supposed to exist among the three Imperial Courts. Some months after the English Government had for the sake of harmony concurred in the ANDRASSY Note, the Emperor of RUSSIA, in a hurried visit to Berlin, drew up the Berlin Memorandum and for-

warded it to London, Paris, and Rome, with a request for an immediate answer by telegraph. France and Italy, which hastily adopted his proposal, were believed afterwards to approve of Lord DERBY's more cautious and more dignified policy. It is certain that neither of the two Powers had perceived, when they gave their assent to the Memorandum, that its necessary and logical consequence would be an armed interference in the affairs of Turkey. The Duke of ARGYLL seems to admit that even at that time the English Government could not have finally abandoned the policy of the Crimean war. The controversy on the independence of Turkey which occupied a considerable space in the debate is almost entirely verbal. A State may be technically independent although it is compelled to endure the menaces or the dictation of a stronger Power. It might have been argued that Austria was not independent when, in direct opposition to the wishes and interests of the Government and the nation, an Austrian contingent was furnished on the demand of NAPOLEON for the invasion of Russia; yet a year afterwards the dependent Empire was at the head of the coalition which finally suppressed the French usurpation. In a later generation FREDERICK WILLIAM IV. of Prussia obeyed the peremptory command of the Emperor NICHOLAS by submitting to the encroachments of Prince SCHWARTZENBERG, when the Prussian army had been already mobilized in prospect of a rupture with Austria. Lord BEACONSFIELD had no difficulty in proving that the Duke of ARGYLL was not strictly correct in denying the independence of Turkey; but, as Lord SALISBURY said in one of his despatches, Turkish independence must be understood in a sense which is not incompatible with the diplomatic interference of Europe.

There was much animated though barren discussion on the propriety of Lord DERBY's repeated declarations that no coercion would be applied by England to the Porte. As Lord SALISBURY said, it would have been impossible, if it had been desirable, to keep the secret; and the Government would have been justly censured for shrinking from the employment of force, if it had been implicitly threatened. Lord SALISBURY also reminded the House of Lords that at the Conference not even Russia had spoken of coercion, though the army in Bessarabia may be regarded as an intelligible menace. It is still possible, if not probable, that peace may be maintained, for there is reason to hope that the warlike agitation which lately prevailed in Russia has partially subsided. The EMPEROR is said to have recovered the control of the national policy, and journals which are believed to represent the opinion of some of his Ministers now deprecate war, on the ground that Russia might eventually be deprived of its fruits by the intervention of Europe. It is indeed necessary for the Russian advocates of peace to recommend moderation as if it were preparatory to future war; but, if the immediate danger can be conjured away, solicitude for the future may be easily postponed. The studiously vague language used by the Emperor WILLIAM at the opening of the German Parliament seems, if it conveys any information, to indicate a belief in the possibility of averting war. Although none of the Governments have yet replied to the Russian Circular, it is well known that they will, on the same or different grounds, agree in declining to take part in the coercion of Turkey. Russia will therefore be compelled either to pause or to advance alone. If peaceable counsels prevail, it will not be difficult to find a pretext for withdrawing the Moscow declaration, although a Power of the first order need

not condescend to make excuses. It is possible to assume a provisional belief in the new Turkish Constitution, notwithstanding Lord SALISBURY's pungent criticisms, and in spite of the comment on the new reforms which was furnished by the arbitrary banishment of their author. In a few days it will probably be known whether peace is concluded with Servia and Montenegro; and perhaps, if a respite is allowed, the Turkish Government may at last perform some of its promises by an improvement of the provincial administration; but Lord BEACONSFIELD himself at last acknowledges the disappointment with which he finds that the Turks are entirely devoid of common sense.

Although it was natural that the Duke of WESTMINSTER should defend his conduct in presiding at the St. James's Hall Conference, he virtually admitted the inexpediency of the celebration, when he declared that it would not have been held if the policy of the Government had been at that time made public. Lord DERBY's despatch to Sir HENRY ELLIOT on the Bulgarian massacres had been published long before, and Lord SALISBURY was already engaged in the duties of his mission. The managers of the undertaking were justly blamed for their officious pretension to furnish the English Plenipotentiaries with instructions which might or might not conflict with the policy of the Government. It was already known that Mr. GLADSTONE had not been an original promoter of the Conference; but it derived nearly all its importance from his participation in its proceedings. The Duke of WESTMINSTER's vindication was really equivalent to an apology, which would not have been superfluous if the Bulgarian agitation had not been obsolete. The debates in Parliament, and especially in the House of Lords, have to a great extent corrected the one-sided declamation of the vehement orators of the Conference. It may almost be said that free oral discussion is confined to Parliament. Speakers at public meetings almost always address an audience which is already convinced, and the representatives of a faction assembled, as at St. James's Hall, to express positive opinions, might be thought to assume the title of a Conference in mere irony. The advantages of Parliamentary debate consist not only in the comparison of conflicting arguments, but in the restraint which is imposed on either party by the presence of its opponents. The Duke of ARGYLL was even more eloquent in the House of Lords than at Glasgow; but he was far more moderate in his denunciation of the policy of the Government. For the present there may perhaps be a lull in the controversy which seems to be exhausted.

GERMANY.

THE German EMPEROR, or those who have assisted him in the composition of his Speech, must evidently be well acquainted with the quieting influence of strictly commonplace topics. The Session which opened on Thursday is not only the first of a new German Parliament, it is also a Session which, from the character of the elections, is expected to be unusually exciting. The Socialists have been exceedingly busy all over Germany, and while they have carried ten seats, their occupants represent a party which had the courage and activity to put forward more than a hundred and twenty candidates. Nor do these ten members by any means complete the tale of Socialist strength in a division. Their first advances will naturally take the form of motions for investigation, for the appointment of Commissioners, and the like. There are points upon which no one feels inconveniently pledged by merely asking for inquiry, though a Government may easily feel itself inconveniently pledged by conceding inquiry. If a member of Parliament voted in favour of appointing a Committee to consider the origin of evil, he would not be supposed to have any special theory on the subject. But if a Government allowed such a Committee to be appointed, it would certainly be taken as tantamount to an admission that the Government was in some way responsible for the existence of evil, and was doing no more than its duty in tracing the mischief to its source. There is more than one section of the German Parliament that will be quite ready to march side by side with the Socialists in these preliminary skirmishes. Herr WINDTHÖRST has already declared that the Socialist claims rest on genuine grievances, and that the Ultramontane party will do all in its power to distinguish what is well from what is ill founded in their claims. This is quite enough for any present ends that the Socialist leaders may

have in view. They do not expect to get German society reorganized in a day. They will be very well satisfied if their ten members can make as much noise during the Session as though they numbered a hundred. And if they are judicious, and confine themselves strictly to generalities—to the dulness of trade, the material suffering which this dulness brings upon the working-classes, and the duty of the representatives of the Empire to examine carefully into the causes which have brought it about—they will have no difficulty in finding allies. The Socialist leaders may have no special dislike to the May laws; but they have a very real dislike to the general tenor of German laws, and this is quite enough to make a temporary union between them and the Ultramontanes. Herr WINDTHÖRST will argue that any ally is good for the pious end of freeing the Church from oppression. The Socialists will argue that, if one set of laws very dear to Prince BISMARCK's heart can be repealed, it will be a good omen for the success of future attacks on other sets of laws. The Particularists will be ready to do anything which, by embarrassing a usurping Legislature, may dispose it to grant larger and larger measures of Home Rule. In Lorraine all the candidates returned were something more than Particularists, and they will probably repeat their previous performance of protesting against annexation and going home. But in Alsace a fair number of Autonomist deputies have been returned, and an Autonomist Alsatian is likely to be a thorn in the side of the German CHANCELLOR whenever he can be so without defeating the immediate object for which he has been returned. The Autonomists are probably in bad odour with many of their neighbours because they are accused of subordinating their love of France to their desire for those provincial privileges which will not be conceded to Alsace until its representatives show that they are a Parliamentary force that must be reckoned with. An Autonomist deputy will be anxious therefore to convince those he has left at home that, though he may be at issue with them on the particular line to be taken in an election, yet his heart is in the right place. These Socialist motions give him precisely the opportunity he is in search of. He probably holds them to be meaningless, or, if he has the instinctive dislike of Socialism which is natural to a man engaged in commerce, he argues that, whatever harm Germany may take from the falling out of German thieves, honest Frenchmen will still have a chance of coming by their own. The less pronounced Particularists, those who only wish to modify, not upset, the present order of things, will still be inclined to do anything that may annoy the Government, if it is only for the sake of being bought off by small concessions. Altogether, therefore, though there may be no reason to expect that the Government will sustain any serious defeat, it is quite on the cards that it may now and again have to put up with some little reverse. The mere fact that the members have come to Berlin with a sense that something is going to happen, that the present Session is to be more exciting at all events than those that have gone before it, that the old obedient unity of the Legislature is gone, and that, if Prince BISMARCK cannot be beaten he may at least be badgered, is a feeling which is not unlikely to provide its own justification.

Upon any anticipations of this kind the EMPEROR's speech must have fallen with a depressing effect. The deputies who came into the House full of a certain restrained excitement were received with a long enumeration of Bills of indisputable utility and equally indisputable dulness. They were in the position of schoolboys meditating rebellion who find the master busy as usual in giving out verses and correcting exercises. They may console themselves by reflecting that, after all, the move rests with themselves; but it is discouraging for the moment to find that any move they can make is thought of too little importance to deserve mention. The EMPEROR begins by congratulating himself on the composition of the new Parliament, which is in itself an occasion of discouragement to men who have been flattering themselves that the elections have inflicted a serious blow on the Government. Next come intimations of a severely practical kind with regard to the deficit in the revenue and to the measures which must be taken to meet it. At present this deficit is provided for by increased contributions from the Confederate Governments, and it will be hard for a Particularist to resist proposals which aim at reducing the burdens which this system imposes upon the several States. Yet, if new sources of Imperial revenue are to be opened up, as the EMPEROR

suggests, the process of Imperial consolidation will inevitably be helped on. The more the income of the Empire takes the form of a national revenue, the more evident will be the progress made in the effacement of Particularist distinctions. Other measures are to be laid before Parliament, pointing in the same general direction. The income and expenditure of the Empire are to be subjected to a new Court of Control. The place in which the Imperial tribunal created by the legislation of last Session is to sit has to be decided. Announcements of this kind convey an unpleasant impression that, after all, nothing has been changed by the elections. The Imperial machine is going on working just same, and wherever a new wheel is needed a new wheel will be added, just as though there were no members returned who wish to stop the machine altogether. Of course, the discouragement arising from this cause will not be of long duration. The deputies who dislike the existing order of things will soon cheer themselves with the thought that Governments do not usually invite opposition by giving notice that they expect to be opposed. It is only a first impression that the author of the Speech has succeeded in making; but then a first impression is all that as yet he has had the opportunity of making, and he has shown that he is careful to let no opportunity go unimproved. Other paragraphs of the EMPEROR'S Speech deal with such matter-of-fact subjects as inquiries into disasters at sea, and the need of a new patent law. And then, after the edge of the listener's appetite has been taken off by this innocent but heavy pudding, there comes a paragraph to which every deputy must have listened with eager ears:—"The state of depression in which the trade of Germany has been plunged for the last two years still continues." Here at last was a frank admission of the state of things which has given Socialism its new importance. But the course that followed this admission must have been nearly as unsatisfying as the course which had preceded it. The deputies who listened to the Speech may have carried away with them some notion of what the paragraph relating to Socialism meant, but in that case they have a very decided advantage over foreign readers. The EMPEROR has not been convinced that the internal circumstances of the German Empire have materially contributed to this calamity, and he feels certain that the revival of trade is not impeded by any want of confidence in the future solidity of institutions connected with individual rights within the German frontier. Negative observations of this kind have the merit that they pledge the speaker to nothing, while they show at the same time that the Government is not blind to the existence of commercial anxiety. They will not prevent inconvenient debates from being raised during the Session; but they convey an impression that the authorities have surveyed the question beforehand, and have convinced themselves that it is not as serious as those who raise it wish to make the country suppose.

THE UNFINISHED DEBATE.

THE only important result of the unfinished debate of yesterday week was contained in Mr. HARDY'S formal declaration that the Government would not join in any measure of coercion against Turkey. Mr. GLADSTONE committed an anachronism in raising the immaterial issue whether at any former time and in any imaginable contingency the Government would have made war with Russia in defence of Turkey. It is highly probable that such a course might have been adopted with the almost unanimous approval of the country if events which have not happened had happened, and if events which have happened had not happened. A year ago it would have been difficult to find an excuse for not discharging the obligations of the Tripartite Treaty on the demand of Austria; nor had any party then proposed the abandonment of the traditional policy of England. Fortunately, Austria had no occasion to apply for English aid; and unfortunately the Bulgarian massacres occurred. Before they were known, Lord DERBY had warned the Ottoman AMBASSADOR that the Porte was not to infer from the rejection of the Berlin Memorandum that Turkey would be supported by England in a policy of resistance. Only factions objects can be promoted by hypothetical criticisms on the theoretical opinions which may at any time have been held by the Ministers. It would have been more convenient if Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE had on the first night of the Session anticipated Mr. HARDY'S statement,

as he had himself repudiated coercion in a speech delivered a few days before at Liverpool. Parliament is now informed of the intention of the Government, and it is evident that the Opposition is not at present eager to join issue on the question of war with Turkey. The confusion of their counsels was curiously illustrated by Mr. ASHLEY'S repudiation of a crusading policy, and by his simultaneous proposal that the English fleet should threaten Constantinople. Mr. ASHLEY is well aware that the passage of the Dardanelles would be an act of war, even if it were not effected by force. The co-operation of the English fleet with the Russian army is the only measure which has been hitherto suggested by the advocates of a crusade. Mr. ASHLEY is not so frivolous a politician as to recommend the use of menace unless he were prepared, in default of the submission of Turkey, to resort to force. It is odd that Mr. CHAPLIN, when he exposed himself to the charge of irregularity by proposing a series of questions to Mr. GLADSTONE, forgot to inquire whether he was prepared to declare war against Turkey. Mr. CHAPLIN may perhaps have rendered a disinterested service to his party by drawing Mr. GLADSTONE'S fire on himself. It was in some sense a triumph for a rising private member to provoke the hostile leader into a furious declamation consisting principally of repeated assertions of Mr. GLADSTONE'S immeasurable superiority to Mr. CHAPLIN. The difference of political rank, of experience, of knowledge, and of eloquence, scarcely needed elaborate exposition. The taunt that Mr. CHAPLIN had neither written pamphlets nor met Mr. GLADSTONE before a mob or a packed audience was feeble and absurd. The meeting at St. James's Hall would not even listen to Lord SHAFTESBURY when he attempted to say a word in recommendation of justice and caution. Even if an equal contest had been possible, it is no apology for a perverse pamphlet or a mischievous speech to say that those who disapprove of unsound doctrines are at liberty to confute them. Those who are most liable to be misled are least inclined to listen to argument on the other side of the question.

This debate, the intended resumption of which has been judiciously relinquished, may perhaps have in some degree appeased the impatience which has found expression in innumerable questions that seemed likely to turn the Blue-book into a catechism. The politician, like the elementary teacher, desires, under pretence of gratifying his curiosity, to instruct or to confute. Mr. GLADSTONE, for instance, in asking who were certain important persons mentioned by Sir HENRY ELLIOT, intends to deny an implied quotation of his own language. The Turks, according to the statement in the despatch, had heard with little satisfaction that certain important persons proposed that they should be expelled from Europe. They had not, when Mr. GLADSTONE said that they must carry themselves off out of Bulgaria bag and baggage, anticipated his successive explanations which ultimately resulted in the mild suggestion that some Turkish functionaries should resign their offices. A vigorous Ministerial leader might put an end to unbecoming sneers and quibbles by refusing once for all to be catechized as to the interpretation of documents which explain themselves; but perhaps it may be well to wait for the spontaneous discontinuance of a transient trick or fashion. The more legitimate question whether the Government would reply to Prince GORTCHAKOFF'S Circular was objectionable only because it was premature. It is obviously prudent in the first place either to establish a concert with the neutral Powers or at least to ascertain their intentions. The Russian Government has exhibited no anxiety for an immediate answer; and if authentic information is desired, it is easy to refer to Mr. HARDY'S speech. Although the phrases used by the various Governments may not be identical, there can be little doubt that they will all refuse to adopt coercive measures, and that they will also decline to authorize Russia to execute the decisions of the Conference. In the probable contingency of war, the invader would certainly not consider an International Commission, or the concurrence of the European Powers in the appointment of Governors-General, an adequate reward of victory. If the issue of the Circular was suggested by a wish to find a pretext for the maintenance of peace, it will be desirable to facilitate a retreat by any diplomatic formula which may not involve rash and embarrassing pledges.

Desultory and irregular debates on the Eastern question at the beginning of the Session were unavoidable, and they

may perhaps not have been wholly useless. It was natural and convenient that many different shades of opinion should find expression before Parliament finally settled the practical issues with which alone it has ultimately to deal. Mr. SMYTH's eloquent speech in support of the claims of the Southern Slavs and the Greeks gave utterance to sympathies which are widely spread; but the House of Commons has to deal with existing Governments, with European policy, and with English interests; nor can it profitably indulge in vague aspirations for the future welfare and union of oppressed and scattered races. Mr. SMYTH indeed consistently repudiated the fragmentary reforms which were devised by the Conference with the real or professed object of rendering Turkish dominion more tolerable and therefore more permanent. Similar appeals were made to English sympathy on behalf of Poland in 1831 and 1864, and when the Hungarians were gallantly struggling in 1849 for the defence of their ancient Constitution; but, although the national feeling was almost unanimous, Parliament properly abstained from the expression of opinions to which the Government was not prepared to give practical effect. At present the Opposition, notwithstanding the irritable restlessness of some of its leaders, shows its practical concurrence with the policy of Ministers by not taking a formal division. Mr. GLADSTONE and Sir W. HARCOURT cannot have deluded themselves by the hasty excuse that it is a waste of trouble to divide against a known majority. If the principle were generally adopted, Governments would be unopposed during the whole term of Parliament; and important questions would be periodically referred to a plebiscite in the form of a general election. If Lord HARTINGTON and his party were united in support of an offensive alliance with Russia against Turkey, they would, even at the risk of certain defeat, embody their policy in a resolution, and submit it to the judgment of the House of Commons. It would be less easy to take issue on Mr. ASHLEY's scheme of a warlike operation which should not involve actual war. Other members of his party have pointed to the same impossible result, though they have shrunk from a crude and paradoxical conclusion. Lord DERBY has been frequently reminded of the imperfect compliance of the Turkish Government with his peremptory demands for the punishment of the criminals in Bulgaria. Even Lord GRANVILLE and Lord HARTINGTON have significantly asked whether the Government was prepared to acquiesce in the rejection of the demands of the Conference. In all cases the Government ought to answer that force was never threatened, and that force will not be applied. If there has been inconsistency, the error lay, not in submission to a rebuff, but in the urgency which rendered a rebuff possible. When England withdrew from the protectorate of Turkey, the Government lost the fulcrum from which it might have exercised pressure on the Porte. Lord SALISBURY's unfriendly demeanour at Constantinople corresponded with the new policy of his Government, but it could have little tendency to conciliate the Turkish Ministers. They had no longer anything to hope from England, and they rightly assumed that they had also nothing to fear. It is possible that the opponents of the Government may be waiting for the occurrence of some new revolution at Constantinople. If the rumours of the condition of the SULTAN are confirmed, the policy of England and of the other Powers may perhaps require reconsideration.

THE AMERICAN PRESIDENCY.

THE decision of the statutory tribunal on the Presidential election will have been regarded with dissatisfaction and disappointment by dispassionate Americans as well as by foreigners, who are necessarily disinterested. Mr. HAYES may probably be as good a President as Mr. TILDEN, and either candidate would have had the means of appointing a respectable Cabinet; but the sense of injustice will during the tenure of office by a Republican President rankle in the minds of the defeated party. It is possible that the verdict of the tribunal may have been consistent with law, and even that all the members may have voted in accordance with their conscientious convictions; but as all important questions were settled by a strict party division, no confidence can be placed in the soundness or good faith of the judgment. The appointment of five Democrats and five Republicans by the two branches of Congress

was from the first regarded as an empty form. It was generally assumed that they would all prefer their political bias to their judicial duties; but it was at one time thought that the interpretation of doubtful points of constitutional law might be safely entrusted to Judges of the Supreme Court. It happened that, of the four who came first on the list, two were Republicans and two were Democrats. The fifth would have been a Democrat if, immediately before the constitution of the tribunal, Judge DAVIS had not been elected to the Senate. His substitute, Judge BRADLEY, was a Republican appointed by General GRANT when he packed the Supreme Court for the purpose of securing a reversal of the judgment which nullified the Legal Tender Act. The satisfaction which was expressed by the Republicans at the selection of Judge BRADLEY was neither complimentary to himself nor of good omen for the integrity of the tribunal. No moral weight can attach to judgments which were in every instance given by a party majority, and opposed by an equally unanimous party minority. No prudent Englishman could have expressed a confident opinion whether it was allowable to revise the decisions of the Returning Boards, if both Houses of Congress had not virtually authorized the appeal by creating a tribunal which had no other serious duty to discharge. It was already known that the official returns were in favour of Mr. HAYES; and it was notorious that the result was caused by the interference of the Returning Boards. In Louisiana and South Carolina Mr. TILDEN had obtained large majorities, which were disregarded by the Returning Boards on the ground or pretext of intimidation supposed to have been practised by the Democrats. It seems that in some districts intimidation had been practised; but the Returning Board secured the triumph of the Republicans by rejecting a much larger number of returns to which there was no valid objection. If the tribunal had, after examining all the facts, confirmed or reversed the decision of the Returning Boards, it would have conformed to the apparent intentions of Congress. It was not worth while to pass an extraordinary law for the purpose of proving that eight Republicans could out-vote seven Democrats.

If any citizen of the United States cares to extenuate a national scandal by reference to English precedents, he may be glad to learn that thirty or forty years ago Election Committees of the House of Commons were as unscrupulous as the Washington tribunal. For some years after the Reform Bill, the result of a disputed election was almost certainly known as soon as the names of the Committee were published. The only argument which can be used in mitigation of a disgraceful practice is that it was gradually corrected by a spontaneous improvement in the Parliamentary conscience or sense of honour. Long before the transfer of jurisdiction from Committees to Election Judges inquiries into disputed elections were conducted as fairly and impartially as trials at Nisi Prius. In the meantime the delinquents were laymen and professed politicians, who perhaps soothed their consciences by the reflection that neither party was more unprincipled than the other. The only instance in which a high judicial tribunal was exposed to similar suspicion was in the case of O'CONNELL's conviction, which was brought by appeal before the House of Lords. The only weak point in the conviction was a minute technical flaw which had been discovered by the astuteness of an eminent special pleader. Lord LYNDEHURST and Lord BROUGHAM who then generally acted with the Tories, gave judgment against the objection, while Lord COTTENHAM and Lord DENMAN allowed its validity. On the merits of the quibble even lawyers could scarcely pronounce a positive opinion; but it was generally thought unfortunate that the division among the Law Lords should coincide with party preferences; and Lord DENMAN, with singular want of tact, confirmed the prevailing impression by an irrelevant and unseasonable flourish of rhetoric, ending with the phrase, which has since become almost proverbial, of "a mockery, a delusion, and a snare." It is probable that all the Law Lords were sincerely convinced of the soundness of their conclusions; and it oddly happened that the result was in a high degree beneficial to the party which had incurred a seeming defeat. Thoroughly cowed by his imprisonment, O'CONNELL for the remainder of his life tacitly abandoned the reckless agitation which had brought Ireland to the verge of civil war. His alliance, which had always done the Whigs more harm than good, was from that time valueless as well as damaging.

It is not improbable that a similar practical result may follow from the discreditable victory of the Republicans before the tribunal. It is well known that the best and soundest portion of the people of the United States either stand at ordinary times aloof from party, or hang but loosely on its skirts. The public honour will be regarded by all except bitter partisans as more valuable than any political triumph; and, although the Democratic members of the tribunal may have been as factions as the majority, the successful party will fitly be held responsible for the discredit which has been incurred, not only by the Senate and the House of Representatives, but by the Supreme Court, which was once regarded with universal respect and confidence. In future elections the Republicans will be held responsible for the flagrant scandal which is chiefly due to the activity of their principal leaders. The character of the party had been for many years compromised by the conduct of its managers. Mr. CAMERON and his son, General BUTLER, Mr. CHANDLER, and Mr. MORTON had deserved and obtained a reputation for smartness which was scarcely compatible with a belief in their political honesty. Mr. HAYES, who probably deserves the high character which he bears, will be as little able as General GRANT to detach himself from supporters who are profoundly distrusted by the community. It is improbable that the next Presidential term should be fruitful in useful legislation, or that new cases of corruption should not be disclosed. The most obvious mode of censuring a discreditable faction will be to vote for Democratic candidates in State and Federal elections. The Republicans can scarcely hope to retain the votes of Louisiana and South Carolina by the audacious practice of perpetually disfranchising the local majority. Before the next Presidential election the whole South will be united against the Republicans, and their majority in the North will be seriously impaired.

The House of Representatives has not unnaturally hesitated to accept the decision of the tribunal; but the leaders of the party wisely recommend acquiescence, and their followers will eventually adopt their advice. In a moment of unusual and undue confidence in the candour of their opponents, the Democrats urged an appeal to a judicial body to be established for the purpose. They may now admit that they have been outwitted, and they will not repeat the error of trusting a Republican, even though he may be a Judge of the Supreme Court. It would be highly imprudent to defeat the election of a President by delay, with the result of transferring the nomination to the new House of Representatives while there is a Republican majority of States. A protest is proper and becoming; but further opposition would only tend to convince dispassionate Americans that both parties were alike factions and unprincipled. It may be some consolation to the Democrats to reflect that the tribunal might have attained the same object in a more plausible manner. If evidence on the merits had been taken, the party majority would have been as available to confirm the decision of the Returning Boards as to secure them from investigation. Patriotic Democrats will also remember the necessity of electing a President who may hold office by an undisputed title. It is for the public interest that, as Mr. TILDEN has probably been tricked out of the Presidency, Mr. HAYES should be lawfully qualified to hold the office. Few Americans will hereafter look back with complacency to the recent contest and its result.

ENGLISH DOCTORS IN FRANCE.

IN the eyes of a large section of Englishmen, and that a section which has the strongest claim upon public sympathy, the internal policy of the French Government is just now as nothing in point of interest when compared with its foreign policy. It is not, however, with the relations between France and Russia or France and Germany that our countrymen are concerned. They are quite willing to leave the Eastern question in the hands of the appointed Ministers. The one object of their speculations at this moment is the attitude which the French authorities propose to assume towards English doctors living in France. In becoming a hospital for so large a number of Englishmen, the Mediterranean coast has become a second fatherland to a corresponding number of English medical men. It is bad enough for invalids to have to leave behind so much that they have been accustomed to; but it would be an insup-

portable misfortune if they had to leave native doctors behind also. To hear the familiar questions put in the familiar words; to hear the drugs that have become as habitual as food called by the names to which they are accustomed; to have no dispiriting doubts as to the degree of the adviser's appreciation of that admirable mystery, an English constitution—all these are comforts for the sake of which an English patient would unhesitatingly forego the climate he loves. It is easy to conceive, therefore, the consternation which has overtaken all who are accustomed to spend their winters in the South of France on hearing that a Bill is actually before the Chamber of Deputies prohibiting the practice of medicine by foreigners who have not passed the examinations prescribed by the French faculty. It is plain that, if this Bill should become law, English invalids would have to choose between giving up their doctors and giving up their winter homes. The medical profession has never been wanting in regard for its own dignity; and it is scarcely conceivable that an English doctor enjoying full liberty to practise in England would present himself to a French Board of Examiners with the prayer that they would be good enough to pronounce on his fitness to prescribe for his own consumptive countrymen. English patients would hear with dismay that the doctors they had known had left Nice or Cannes or Mentone, and that no successors were coming to take their places. The news would suggest to them, not the inquiry, How shall we do without them? but the far more easily answered question, Where can we go with the certainty that our doctors can come too? There would be no difficulty in finding places which would answer this indispensable condition. The Mediterranean has other shores than those of France, and a colony of English invalids is too valuable a possession to dispose other Governments to make the same blunder as that to which the French doctors seem to be anxious to commit the French Legislature. If so commonplace a sentiment as the desire for English fees can find a home in scientific breasts, it may be worth while to point out that, if this Bill is passed, it will still remain ungratified. The exclusion of English doctors from France will injure French landlords and French shopkeepers, but it will certainly not do any good to French physicians.

At the same time we are very far from saying that the present state of the French law with regard to the practice of medicine by foreigners is satisfactory. From the *exposé des motifs* prefixed to M. MARVAISE'S Bill it appears that for three-quarters of a century successive French Governments have granted the right of practising medicine to foreigners on the production of a diploma conferred by a foreign University. The effect of this law in some cases has been to invest graduates of foreign Universities with a right which does not belong to them in the country where they obtained their degree. In Germany, for example—we are still quoting the *exposé des motifs*—the University title of M.D. does not confer professional rights; they are only to be obtained by those on whom the State, after examination, has conferred the title of Practising Physician. Until lately a similar rule was in force in Belgium, and it still is in Holland and Switzerland. Thus a foreign medical man may impose himself on a too confiding French public by virtue of a double misconception. They do not know how he obtained his doctor's degree, and consequently they assume that it is of French origin, or that at all events it implies the possession of the same amount of knowledge as is required by the French law. Or, if they know that it was given by a foreign University, they assume that it represents the amount of knowledge which is required by the law of their own country. Worse than this, it has become a habit with a certain class of French general practitioners—*Officiers de Santé*—to go abroad to get the title of doctor which they would not obtain at home without undergoing a different course of training and a more stringent examination. The genuine French doctor is not only confronted by pretenders from foreign countries, but by pretenders with foreign degrees who are all the time his own countrymen. It is obvious that no recognized English practitioner can have any desire to shield, directly or indirectly, these pretenders to medical knowledge. No man, whether he be doctor or patient, can complain if the French law is not more tender to him than the law of his own country. If a German or a Dutch physician must obtain a State degree before he is admitted to practice, he has no claim to practise in France without that degree. If the German Governments do not accept the medical de-

degrees of a German University as an adequate test of medical qualifications, they may be admitted to be better judges in the matter than any foreign Government can pretend to be; and no German would have any right to complain if he found the same qualification insisted on in both countries.

This is precisely the kind of question that it takes a little diplomacy to settle, but which a little diplomacy ought to be perfectly able to settle. The real interest of the medical profession in the two countries is the same. In each it is for the good alike of doctors and patients that unqualified practitioners should not be able to take advantage of any accidental loophole left in the law. No English doctor wishes to have men who could not practise in England allowed to practise in France. No French doctor can really wish to have men who are allowed to practise in England forbidden to practise in France. In saying this, we do not forget that local and personal jealousies may in particular instances have generated a shortsighted desire to get rid of the foreign doctors, in the expectation that the foreign patients would remain. But this feeling cannot long be proof against the unwillingly admitted conviction that when the foreign doctors have gone the foreign patients will not remain. And besides this, it is a feeling which can have little or no influence on the Legislature, except so far as it finds support in the higher ranks of the profession, and this support will only be given by those who believe that, under the present law, unqualified foreign practitioners do make their entry into France. As regards the English Government, therefore, there seems no doubt as to the course to be adopted. The object which Englishmen and Frenchmen have equally in view is to ensure, so far as this can be done by examinations and diplomas, that no incompetent doctor shall be allowed to practise, and that no competent doctor shall be forbidden to practise. The first thing to be done, therefore, is to make both Governments acquainted with the nature of the tests exacted from medical men before they are allowed to practise in their own countries. If the French authorities are dissatisfied with the qualifications demanded from an English doctor, it will be open to them to discuss with the English authorities the nature of the defect, and the best means of supplying it. In that case there is no probability that the English Government would be indisposed to reconsider the present scheme of examination, and the qualifications of the several examining bodies. We in this country have nothing to gain by the admission of unqualified practitioners; on the contrary, if our arrangements on this head can be shown to be insufficient, we have everything to gain from their being amended. If, on the other hand, the French authorities are content with the English standard of medical qualifications, and merely plead that as a matter of fact there are English doctors practising in France who do not come up to this standard, it is no business of the English authorities to shelter in a foreign country men whom they would refuse to shelter at home. Either way it is probable that a little frank discussion between really competent men on both sides would remove every difficulty. Mr. BOURKE's answer to Dr. LUSH's question on Thursday is therefore as satisfactory as at this stage of the discussion any answer could be. The French Government have asked for full information as to the law and custom in England with regard to the practice of medicine, and a suggestion for the settlement of the question has been made by the Medical Council of Education, which is now being considered by the French authorities. There is reason to hope that the result of the controversy will be to put English doctors practising in France in a more rather than a less satisfactory position than that they now enjoy.

THE WILTON ELECTION.

MR. FAWCETT cannot be blamed for interesting himself in an election in his own county; but he would probably not have interfered in the contest at Wilton if he had known how few of the electors sympathized with his opinions. It seemed probable that his statement of the cause of the vacancy would be confirmed or corrected by those who are personally concerned in the transaction; and Sir EDMUND ANTROBUS has fully explained his reasons for retiring. Utterly disapproving of the Bulgarian agitation in the autumn, he was indisposed either to act for the present with his own party or to

leave its ranks; and it also seems that he had been prepared at some indefinite time to make room for a member of the HERBERT family. The substitution of Mr. SIDNEY HERBERT for Sir EDMUND ANTROBUS seems at first sight more consistent with the usages of a former generation than with the democratic austerity of modern times; but the right of approving such arrangements seems to rest with the constituency, which has returned its new member with a remarkable approach to unanimity. Mr. SIDNEY HERBERT is probably known to his friends and neighbours as a young man of promise; but his claim to the suffrages of the electors rested mainly on the fact that he was the son of his father, and the natural representative in the House of Commons of the ancient and powerful family to which he belongs. The explanation of his political opinions has not been reported; but it may be presumed that he agrees with Lord PEMBROKE, who was a member of the present Government until he was forced by ill health to retire. The late Lord HERBERT also entered public life as a Conservative, though he afterwards followed Sir ROBERT PEEL in his conversion to Free Trade, and finally served in Lord ABERDEEN's Coalition Government, and in Lord PALMERSTON's second Administration. Mr. FAWCETT showed a want of judgment in reminding the Liberal party at Wilton that Mr. SIDNEY HERBERT had formerly been attacked in debate by Mr. DISRAELI. The followers of Sir ROBERT PEEL in those days made no secret of their resentment against his formidable assailant; and Mr. SIDNEY HERBERT on more than one occasion used for the purpose the strongest language which was consistent with Parliamentary rules. If he had always come off with impunity from a personal encounter with Mr. DISRAELI he would have been more fortunate than any of his contemporaries who tried the same experiment. Lord BEACONSFIELD has never borne malice against his political opponents; and, if Mr. SIDNEY HERBERT were now alive, he would not wish to recall the memory of forgotten personalities. An appeal to the regard which the people of Wilton felt for Lord HERBERT furnished but a paradoxical argument for rejecting the candidature of his son.

The Wilton election has no immediate party significance, except so far as it shows that the electors of one small borough are capable of preferring other considerations to sympathy with oppressed Christians in Turkey. The result is only interesting because it proves that, in spite of modern changes, local influence is not wholly extinct. Although there are many objections to secret voting, the ballot has the advantage of testing the real popularity of doctrines which may be thought attractive to the multitude. The condemnation of the late Government at the general election would not have been so easily admitted as decisive if the defeated party could have attributed the success of their adversaries to intimidation or bribery. On a smaller scale the Wilton election proves that the voters entirely differ from Mr. FAWCETT, both on general politics and on the local expediency of preferring a neighbour to a stranger. It would be highly undesirable to return to the practices of fifty years ago, when a few peers appointed a large number of members of the House of Commons; but the hereditary goodwill of a constituency to an ancient family is neither socially nor politically objectionable. In Wiltshire there are two boroughs which still adhere to former traditions, and only democratic purists greatly regret that Lord LANSDOWNE's brother sits for Calne and Lord PEMBROKE's brother for Wilton. There is no reason to suppose that either constituency is indifferent to the public welfare, although its political opinions may perhaps be modified by personal or local predilections. The reasons which are elsewhere given for the preference of a candidate will not bear too severe an examination. The common form of a resolution that, having heard the speech of A. B., the meeting considers him a fit and proper candidate, is open to criticism. Coincidence of opinion with the electors is not in itself a sufficient proof of moral and intellectual fitness. The selection has probably been in fact finally made before the speech by which it is ostensibly justified has been delivered.

Before the Bulgarian agitation the present Government had no reason to be dissatisfied with the result of occasional elections. The Ministers could advantageously compare their fortune with that of their predecessors, who constantly lost ground from the time of the general election, until Mr. GLADSTONE was frightened or irritated into the desperate experiment of a dissolution while he had still a considerable majority in the House of Commons. For two years after

his accession to office Mr. DISRAELI's majority was unimpaired, and it has not yet been seriously diminished; but the tide of fortune seems to have turned, and Mr. GLADSTONE is more popular than ever with the multitude. The first symptom of a change appeared when a vacancy was created in Buckinghamshire by the elevation of Mr. DISRAELI himself, and Mr. FREMANTLE was only returned by a narrow majority. The election of Mr. SAMUELSON for Frome indicated a similar reaction in a borough of little importance; and there is reason to suppose that the larger towns will, as occasion arises, respond still more freely to the appeals of Mr. GLADSTONE's adherents. The Conservatives could not reasonably hope to win a seat at Halifax, and they seem to have been imprudent in giving the Liberals an opportunity of proving that their majority was increased. It is more than probable that the successor of Mr. COBBETT at Oldham will be a Liberal. The Universities of Glasgow and Aberdeen showed by the return of the LORD ADVOCATE that educated Scotchmen are not disposed to alter their political opinions because the Turks have perpetrated outrages on the Bulgarians. It is indeed remarkable that, although some eminent Scotchmen have taken an active part in the agitation, their countrymen have for the most part abstained from public meetings, and from the movement which was during the autumn general throughout England. The Scotch boroughs are not likely to abandon their uniform practice of returning Liberal members; but the Conservatives may not improbably retain the county seats which they won at the general election.

Two or three years will probably elapse before the next general election; and it is unlikely that the Eastern question in its present phase should occupy public attention during the interval; yet the clamour and excitement of the last autumn will perhaps have seriously damaged the prospects of the Government. As a patient is often permanently weakened by a disease which has long since disappeared, Ministers who have once during their tenure of office been exposed to a storm of abuse and deserved or undeserved unpopularity have much difficulty in recovering the confidence which they may formerly have enjoyed. The conviction that, if they have made mistakes, their conduct has on the whole been prudent and patriotic, will probably become more general among the intelligent classes as misrepresentation and passion subside; but borough householders will remember that Lord BEACONSFIELD and Lord DERBY have been denounced as accomplices of the Turks, and they will not be careful to inquire whether their assailants had an alternative and preferable policy to recommend. On the other hand, the Government has an advantage in the absence of any domestic excitement from which danger can be apprehended. The only important political measure which is proposed by any section of their opponents is Mr. TREVELYAN's scheme for extending the county franchise, which has not yet been adopted by the whole of the party. Mr. FAWCETT in his speech at Wilton complained that Mr. SIDNEY HERBERT would probably vote against the claims of the agricultural labourers. If the constituency took any interest in the question, they probably reflected that their own political privileges would certainly be abolished if the same franchise were established in counties and boroughs. The shopkeepers and artisans of Wilton would find themselves included in a large agricultural district where they would be outvoted by the farm-labourers, acting probably under the direction of the managers of a Trade-Union. Other boroughs will entertain the same selfish apprehensions, and the existing county constituencies are not anxious to be swamped. The far more important question of the disestablishment of the Church is not yet ripe; and, except in the contingency of external misadventures, the Government is probably safe till it encounters the periodical necessity of a leap in the dark at the next dissolution of Parliament.

THE FREE FIGHT ON THE METROPOLITAN RAILWAY.

A REMARKABLE example of the flagrant and systematic repudiation by Railway Companies of the natural obligations and responsibilities which attach to their business has just been afforded in an appeal case which was heard last Saturday, and is justly described as "of considerable interest to the public

"at large." The case arose, as the report states, out of a railway accident due to "the practice, which "passengers on the Metropolitan line know is far too frequent, of allowing passengers to go into carriages already filled, so as to cause great inconvenience and "annoyance and risk of accidents." In this instance the plaintiff was a passenger in a train passing Gower Street station, where three passengers forced themselves into his compartment, which was already quite full. At the next station, Portland Road, there was another rush of people trying to get into the train, and some of them opened the door of the plaintiff's compartment and endeavoured to enter. Upon this the plaintiff rose from his seat in order to prevent any more passengers from coming in; but just at that moment the train was suddenly started, and the plaintiff was thrown forward against the door. He put out his hand to save himself, and it was caught and severely crushed in one of the hinges of the door, which a porter slammed in the usual violent manner, without observing whether there was any one in the way. The plaintiff brought an action for damages on account of this injury, and at the trial the jury returned a verdict in his favour. This verdict was approved by the Judge, and when an appeal was taken to the Common Pleas Division, the judgment of the Court below was confirmed. The Company, however, again appealed; and the case on Saturday last came before four Judges, two of whom, the LORD CHIEF JUSTICE and Lord Justice AMPHLETT, supported the plaintiff's claim, while the other two, the LORD CHIEF BARON and Lord Justice BRAMWELL, were against it; so that the judgment for the plaintiff stands. The CHIEF JUSTICE observed that the Court had nothing to do with the facts of the case, except to decide whether the evidence taken was sufficient to justify the verdict; and that in his opinion it was sufficient, inasmuch as the intrusion of three persons into a carriage already filled at Gower Street Station was in itself a proof of negligence. And then he made some remarks which deserve to be placed on record as the opinion of a high judicial authority as to the manner in which this line of railway is worked. "It was," he said, "the duty of "the Company to provide sufficient carriage accommodation "to meet the ordinary requirements of the traffic, and a "sufficient staff to maintain order; but the intrusion of "passengers into carriages which were already full implied "the absence both of carriage accommodation and of a "sufficient strength of staff to maintain order; and was "consequently a breach of duty on the part of the Railway "Company. Such things seemed to imply the absence "of such a superintendence and supervision of the carriages "as a Railway Company was bound to exercise; and the "fact that the train was despatched before any complaint "was made led to the inference that the train was sent "on with undue haste, and without proper attention, or "that there was no official on the platform to whom complaints might be made. Then came the climax. There "was a rush to the train just as it was in motion, and "persons tried to scramble into the carriage, which the "plaintiff naturally endeavoured to prevent, and so the "accident occurred; and from those circumstances it was "to be inferred that here, again, there was an absence of "sufficient carriage accommodation, or that more tickets "had been issued than an ordinary train could accommodate, which would of course cause disorder and confusion on the platform."

The CHIEF JUSTICE then went on to notice, and dispose of, what he justly called "a strange argument" on behalf of the Company—namely, that the business of a railway required to be carried on in a peculiar and exceptional way, dispatch and the saving of time being the paramount or sole considerations, to which comfort and even safety must be made subordinate; and that hence it was impossible to have that superintendence and control which were desirable. Assuming, he said, this to be so, any such departure from the principles on which all well-conducted lines were managed was not to be presumed to be known to or acquiesced in by the passenger who complained of an injury through negligence, unless it could be shown that he was aware of and acquiesced in so exceptional a mode of conducting the traffic of the line; and it might be answered that, if the Company so regulated the movements of their trains as to allow at each station no more time than was sufficient to enable one set of passengers to scramble in and another set to scramble out as they best may, it behoved them to have an additional staff to

superintend the carriages and to see to the safety of passengers. But the conclusive answer was that, if the system thus pursued afforded any excuse for so striking a departure from the safer rules on which railways ought to be conducted, this was matter for the consideration of a jury. Lord Justice AMPHLETT took the same view of the case, while, on the other hand, the CHIEF BARON and Lord Justice BRAMWELL thought that "there was no evidence of negligence on the part of the Company or the servants 'conducting to the accident.'" Unfortunately, the arguments by which this conclusion was arrived at have not been reported, and it is difficult to guess what they can have been. Assuming, however, the description of the arrangements on this railway given by the CHIEF JUSTICE to be correct, it would appear that the negligence of the Company was of the clearest and most inexcusable kind, and it is satisfactory to know that the judgment stands to that effect.

The CHIEF JUSTICE seems to have good-naturedly supposed that the disgraceful state of things of which he drew such a graphic picture was quite exceptional, and happened only in particular instances; but the fact is notorious that at certain times of the day this scene of dangerous confusion and disorder is habitually reproduced, without any attempt being made by the railway officials to deal with what, from its periodical recurrence, must be regarded as a contingency to be expected and provided for. It is all very well to say that the management of a railway is a difficult matter, and that the public must be content with just what the Companies choose to do for them, no matter what the terms of the contract may be, or how completely and systematically the Companies violate the fair conditions of the bargain. Any one who has been kept waiting in a railway station—which must include pretty well everybody—must have seen the walls placarded with a threatening array of pains and penalties against passengers for the slightest infraction of by-laws; but, on the other hand, the Companies claim on their own account complete exemption from any obligation to fulfil their contracts, except in so far as may be convenient for themselves. When a passenger buys a ticket, he buys the right to a seat in a carriage of the class which he has paid for, and this implies a reasonable amount of comfort in the accommodation provided, which can hardly be said to be fulfilled in the case of a first-class ticket-holder who finds himself packed to suffocation by an excess of passengers, some of whom, from the nature of their intrusion, are probably of a rough and unpleasant kind to come into contact with. On this point it is worth while to remember that, of the whole number of passengers injured or killed in 1875, as alleged by the Companies, by their own misconduct or want of caution, more than one-half, as Captain TYLER tells us, were killed and more than two-thirds injured by falling between carriages and platforms, and in getting into or alighting from trains. Indeed, at the hours of pressure it requires a severe physical conflict to get into a train, and in the struggle weak and timid people, including ladies, are naturally worsted, and see their places occupied by the muscular ruffians to whom facilities for brutality are allowed by the railway officials. This is not a casual occurrence, but a regular incident repeated at various hours on every day, and especially on Sunday nights, and amounts practically to a fraud on the customers of the railway, who are cheated out of the comfortable and safe travelling which they pay for.

It is not only, however, in regard to sufficiency of accommodation in trains that the Companies adopt the principle of violating the terms on which they profess to serve the public, and repudiating all responsibility. Time-tables are published holding out the prospect of accomplishing a journey of a certain distance in a certain time, and in a great many cases these prospects are delusive, and are known to be so to the people who publish them. The Report of the recent Royal Commission shows that unpunctuality is a chronic fault in railway working, and recommends as the only remedy that "increased facilities be afforded to the public to obtain redress by cheap and summary process when trains are late." The Commissioners also report that "cases have existed, and do exist, in which Companies have for an 'unreasonably long period allowed the station and siding accommodation to remain insufficient, and to such an extent as to give rise to serious danger'; and that the Companies frequently introduce new elements of traffic

into a station without making any additional provision for them. Again, we learn from the same source that "cases have occurred in which Companies have been 'simply remiss in keeping the permanent way of the lines 'in proper repair,' and that this is 'simply a matter of inspection and necessary repair, to neglect which is a 'direct breach of the Company's contract with the public.'" Yet practically all this may be done without punishment, at least without any adequate punishment. It is often pleaded that the self-interest of the Companies is sufficient to make them careful to avoid accidents. But this is a very slight security. In 1865, as the Board of Trade returns show, the total compensation paid by the Companies for personal injury was less than one per cent. on the gross receipts. In 1875 the gross receipts were 61,237,000*l.* and the compensation payments only 381,038*l.*; and this amount is not much more than one per cent. on the total cost of the working expenditure for last year. There is also another point in which Railway Companies require to be more sharply looked after, and that is in charging excessive fares for and deranging the regular traffic on the line in order to net a large sum on holiday occasions. The Great Northern Railway, for instance, claims that it has a right to make its time-tables "subject to such alteration or change therein, day by day, as this or any other Company concerned may, without notice, consider it proper to make"; and repudiates all responsibility for such change of times or delays of the trains, or the consequences thereof, of every kind, to any person whatever. The North-Western Company also gives notice that it does "not undertake that the trains shall start or arrive at the time specified in the bills, nor will it be accountable for any loss, inconvenience, or injury which may arise from delays or detention." It is needless to say that these claims are merely arbitrary rules laid down by the Company, and have no legal foundation in cases where injury is caused by neglect of duty.

DISCIPLINE IN THE MERCHANT SERVICE.

SIR CHARLES ADDERLEY announced the other day, in answer to a question from Mr. GORST, that he intended shortly to bring in a Bill for the improvement of discipline in the merchant service. We are afraid it cannot be said that this is a piece of news which is calculated to give much satisfaction to any one who is genuinely interested in the subject. It is putting things mildly to say that the Government have not been fortunate in their maritime legislation. Even the question of seaworthy ships was taken up under compulsion, and it was ultimately laid down again without being brought to any definitive conclusion. He must be a strangely sanguine man who thinks that the Merchant Shipping Act of last Session is the last word that will have to be said on the subjects embraced in it; or that, while it remains the last word, it will be accepted as even a provisional solution of the difficulties which it professes to meet. Yet to ensure that British ships shall be up to their work is but a trifle compared with insuring that British seamen shall be up to their work. A ship comes into port, lies in harbour, is sent into dock, and at all these stages of her history she is under the critical eyes of critics who, if they suspect that anything is wrong, have the means of forcing on an inquiry. If in the end an inquiry is held, it turns upon points which can be fairly well ascertained before the ship starts on her voyage. If her timbers are found to be sound while she is in harbour, they will probably prove sound when she is on the high seas. As regards the quality of the crew, which, so far as the issue of the voyage is concerned, is a point of nearly as much importance as the quality of the ship, no such preliminary evidence is attainable. The seamen are often not engaged until the vessel is loaded and ready to set sail; and even when they are engaged some time before, their conduct on shore is no index to their conduct afloat. In almost every case a new crew is a sealed book even to its own captain until he has had time to get acquainted with his men, and opportunities to make his acquaintance with them really decisive.

It is true that this very circumstance makes the importance of maintaining discipline on board ship all the greater. A merchant captain starts upon a voyage which is to last for months or years, and during the greater part of that

time his own life and the lives of his officers, as well as the safety of the ship and cargo, are virtually at the mercy of the crew. He knows nothing about their previous characters. They may be drunken or incompetent or mutinous, and he has no remedy. He takes them for what they are worth, and bears the risk of their turning out worthless. It is plain that no man would consent thus to carry his life in his hand if he were not armed with the advantage which authority derives from the recognized existence of an exceedingly stringent discipline. Mutiny is an ugly word, and it may be assumed that the great majority of sailors, however lawless and disorderly they may be, will wish to stop short of provoking its application to themselves. It is necessary, therefore, that a captain should be able to force his men to take their choice between mutiny and obedience, and to make up their minds either to destroy their own prospects and expose themselves to very heavy penalties, or to do what they are ordered. On the other hand, it must be remembered that bad captains are no less common than bad sailors, and that, if the captain's life is at the mercy of a mutinous crew, the lives of the crew are equally at the mercy of a cruel or incompetent captain. The powers with which an officer in a merchant ship is necessarily armed are exercised under an almost unparalleled absence of check or responsibility. The complaints which are so often heard of the deterioration of the merchant service may be perfectly well founded, but it is impossible to deal with them by a merely one-sided addition to the sanctions to which the officers can appeal. If the question of discipline on board ship is taken up at all, it must be taken up as a whole. The fact that bad officers make bad sailors must have its full weight allotted to it, and the measures taken to improve the character of the sailor must have their counterpart in measures taken to improve the character of the officers.

Mr. BRASSEY has lately put together a large body of evidence drawn from various sources upon the condition and character of the officers and men of the merchant service; and the general conclusion at which he arrives is that the seamen are not deteriorated, though they have the same faults which they have always had, and that the correction of these faults is to be effected partly by improvements in the system of training both of officers and men, and partly by changes in the mode of payment. We mention this because it bears out the position from which we started, that whatever may be the shortcomings of the merchant service, they are not likely to be corrected by any merely disciplinary measure. In point of fact, any very stringent rules laid down by Parliament would be open to two objections. In the hands of a strong man they would not be wanted; in the hands of a weak man they would be very liable to be abused. The captain of a merchant ship has two things to trust to in dealing with any unruly spirits among his crew—his own resolution, and his popularity with the better disposed men. It will be of very little avail to add to the list of punishments which may be lawfully inflicted on board ship. When the need arises, a determined man will take such measures as he thinks essential for his purpose with very little regard to the letter of any set of regulations. A weak man, on the other hand, would be tempted to apply an exaggerated severity of treatment to comparatively trifling faults, in the confidence that, if ever he was charged by his crew with exceeding his powers, he would have the letter of the law on his side.

Mr. BRASSEY's book will be found a useful manual to those who wish to know what has been done of late years to improve the condition of sailors or to ascertain the particulars in which it needs improvement. He suggests, in the first place, that the advance note should be abolished; that shipowners who make delay in paying off their crews should be compelled to pay interest; and that a compulsory and self-supporting Seaman's Pension Fund should be established under the management of the Board of Trade and the guarantee of the State. He would improve the training of seamen by establishing training ships at the commercial ports, and by giving a Government bonus to shipowners for properly trained apprentices who will engage to serve a year in the navy and afterwards to join the Reserve. As regards officers, Mr. BRASSEY apparently thinks that they can only be benefited by being encouraged to give proof of their capacity for employment of various kinds. This is not the place for any criticism of Mr. BRASSEY's proposals. It is enough to point out that they indicate a totally different direction

of ideas from that in which Sir CHARLES ADDERLEY seems preparing to embark. They have at all events the merit of imposing conditions on the performance of which the Government will be able to insist. If these were put into an Act of Parliament, obedience to the Act might be ensured by officials who had never gone further to sea than the mouth of the harbour. The inevitable fault of all regulations which simply make discipline more strict is that, when once they are passed, neither Parliament nor the Government has anything further to do with them. They must be left to be applied by officers altogether removed from everything in the nature of check or supervision, and at the best they can but supply an excuse for inflicting without necessity penalties which a captain who is up to his work will inflict in case of necessity, whether he does so under the authority of a printed rule or not. We think Sir CHARLES ADDERLEY will find that it is worth considering whether he could not discover a more useful field for his legislative energy.

OUR HALFPENNY ORACLE.

THE oracle is a venerable institution, but it seems to be capable of convenient adaptation to the wants and conditions of modern days, and of being reduced to a very simple and easy process. In ancient times the mysterious authority had to be propitiated with solemn rites and sacrifices, and it was not always that it vouchsafed an answer to its votaries. But nothing could be more complete than the mechanical promptness and certainty of the new contrivance which has lately been devised for the widespread distribution of universal knowledge and the infallible solution of all the problems which unsettle and bewilder modern society. All that is necessary is to address a question to Mr. GLADSTONE through the post, and immediately a post-card is returned containing a decisive reply on the point raised. This is a service which is also, we believe, performed, to the best of their ability, by the editors of certain cheap weekly papers which have a large circulation among the working-classes, and receive the confidences of many anxious minds as to the best sort of hair dye or liver pills, delicate questions of manners, amatory embarrassments, and other social and domestic difficulties; but it is needless to say that a great scholar and statesman like Mr. GLADSTONE is enabled to invest his messages with an authority which much more nearly approaches divine inspiration. It is impossible to say how many hundreds of these cards are daily despatched by this benevolent personage as the chief occupation of his unfettered and irresponsible leisure; but a fair proportion of them get into the papers, and afford an idea of their general character. There is nothing too high or too low, too large or too small, for the attention of this omniscient genius. Sometimes it is a lad in a house of business who is sore about being called a clerk, and whom the benign counsellor consoles with an explanation of the original use of the term. Another time it is some simpleton who wants to have his mind set at rest as to the value and propriety of compulsory vaccination, and who is comforted by an emphatic declaration in favour of liberty, and a suggestive hint that the good of vaccination is an open question as to which any one may act as he pleases. Afterwards, however, the sage acknowledged that he allowed his own household to go through the questionable operation. Again, in regard to the prosecution of SLADE the medium, the oracle came out strongly about freedom, and blamed the Treasury for pursuing a familiar and old-established practice. It seems also that the great statesman sympathises not only with anti-vaccinationists and Spiritualist mediums, but with the very deep people who turn to the beasts and vials of the Apocalypse for guidance as to current events; and, in reply to a "Christadelphian" lecturer at Birmingham, who had forwarded a tract showing that the present crisis in the East is a fulfilment of Scripture prophecies, he says he has been "struck with the apparent ground for the belief that the state of the East may be treated of in the field in which you have been labouring." In many cases Mr. GLADSTONE seems to have a ready formula in response to a flattering intimation of agreement with his views, which he never fails to identify with "the side of humanity and justice, which I need not say is the side also of wisdom;" and, of course, this is also the side of "your very faithful servant, W. E.

"GLADSTONE." An attempt of "justice and wisdom" to solve the question whether the Church of Rome would be likely to gain by the disestablishment of the Church of England seems to have been found rather overpowering; for the seer confesses his inability to reply to the question "as the importance of its subject, and (I am sure) its sincerity would demand"; and all he can say is that he does not think the people of the Church of England are disposed to join the Roman Catholic body. He is more at ease in dealing with the question of opening working-men's clubs on Sundays, as to which he remarks that, while "it was good, on the whole, to keep club houses closed, he would not coerce a majority"—this is a favourite phrase—"if it were a number of persons who, in good faith, not having homes, wished to make use of the club in lieu of them."

These post-cards also give a curious exposition of the distracting doubts which a severe conscience arouses as to whether a retired Minister is justified in exercising, without official knowledge, restraint, or responsibility, his old influence on public affairs; although, it must be said, these doubts do not seem to have had much practical effect in preventing the ex-Minister from seizing or devising every chance of making a political speech. Thus, in declining an invitation to Bristol, he says:—"Engaged in some visits which are of a purely private and friendly character, I have not been able altogether to avoid the consequences of a public gathering on my way; but I feel that, if I were to make visits to great communities at so peculiar a crisis for the purposes of political exposition, I should seem to assume a character which does not belong to me, and that I might also be thought to use the Eastern question, with the weighty duties and vast interests which in its prospective treatment it involves, for purposes personal to myself." It is obvious, however, that this half-measure of avoiding "great communities" and reserving his confidences for by-way places when detained at a railway station, or out for a casual drive to a place where, by a curious coincidence, there happens to be an enthusiastic audience assembled, who insist upon an oration, does not affect the publicity of the addresses. Altogether, the impression which Mr. GLADSTONE seems to have formed of the course of duty now incumbent on him since he has thrown off the burden of office and can give vent to his own personal whims and passions without control, would seem to be that of a fatherly guardian of the people, always ready to advise or help them in any difficulty, if they will only come to him in a filial spirit. The extent of the charge which he appears to think is thus imposed on him may be inferred from his latest post-card, in which he pleads that it is too much to expect that he should be able either to grant or even to acknowledge the vast number of applications for orders of admission to the House of Commons during the discussions on the Eastern question which he is constantly receiving, and that he really cannot do it. Perhaps Mr. GLADSTONE will discover in course of time that the applications for his opinion and advice on all sorts of subjects have also a tendency to become rather troublesome; but if he is plagued in this way, he has only himself to thank for it. No case is known of any other retired statesman either assuming to take the whole world under his care, both in regard to public and private matters, or submitting to perpetual questioning by any number of ignorant and impertinent correspondents who may choose to intrude upon his legitimate privacy.

PROPOSED RESUMPTION OF THE VATICAN COUNCIL.

A TELEGRAM from Rome has been going the round of the daily papers, which has not, so far as we are aware, been contradicted, though neither has it been confirmed, while on the other hand it has formed the subject of comment in various quarters. Yet it is not easy to believe that the Pope has seriously contemplated reassembling the Vatican Council, though it is abundantly intelligible that the Cardinals, to whom His Holiness is said to have referred the question, should have replied that such a step would be inopportune. Pius IX. indeed, to do him justice, has never lacked the courage of his opinions, and if he deemed it for his interest, which is identified in his own mind with the interests of the Church, that the suspended Council should resume its sittings, no considerations of mundane policy—still less any reclamations on the part of the much-enduring episcopate who have suffered so many things at his hands already—would be likely to restrain him from acting in the matter. But the one chief reason

for distrusting the accuracy of the report is that, so far as fallible human judgment may presume to meddle with such high matters, it would very clearly be not at all for the interests which Pius IX. has at heart that the Council should meet again. Whether its meeting originally was for the benefit of the Roman Catholic Church is a question which has been asked, and somewhat trenchantly answered, by many of her most distinguished divines during the seven years that have elapsed since the too famous Vatican decrees were passed. Into that inquiry however we need not enter here. From the Ultramontane point of view, which is that of Pius IX. and the Curia, the Council has on the whole proved a success. It was summoned for a very special and definite purpose, and that purpose was eventually achieved. We do not of course forget that of the many grave subjects previously announced as under preparation in the various preliminary Committees very few were ever brought into debate at all. But there was one point which found no place in the official programme, and was yet declared from the first by writers like "Janus" who knew something of what was going on behind the scenes to be the supreme, if not the sole, motive of the anxiety of the dominant party at Rome to invoke that very resource of a General Council which the traditional jealousy of Rome has taught her most studiously to evade. They were denounced, vilified, and ridiculed by the organs of the Curia, but the event proved they were right. The Council was convoked to proclaim the infallibility of the Pope, and was prorogued the moment it had done so. But inasmuch as the darling scheme of the Jesuit Camarilla who ruled the Court was strenuously resisted by an opposition numerically weak but overwhelmingly preponderant in moral and intellectual force, the business which was meant to have been settled in three weeks—as the *Civiltà Cattolica* had imprudently hinted—had to be prolonged over eight months. And meanwhile several *Schemata* were proposed, changed, and withdrawn, to occupy the time and divert attention from the real question at issue. The Curia triumphed at last, as under the circumstances was inevitable, and the Jesuit conductors of the *Civiltà*, as "Pomponio Leto" has informed us, offered their solemn acknowledgments to Archbishop Manning for his conspicuous services in the attainment of the result. So far therefore as the immediate object of the Council was concerned, the end was gained, though not without some trouble, and the entry of the Italian troops into Rome a few weeks afterwards supplied an excellent excuse for not resuming the interrupted sittings after the summer was over. There can be no doubt that "the intruding Government" would not have offered, as it had in fact no reason or right to offer, any opposition to the continuance of the Synod, and, if we remember rightly, express assurances to this effect were given. But the Court of Rome had no wish for its continuance, least of all under the altered political conditions of the case, and there can be no doubt that it judged wisely, for more reasons than one. As the force of those reasons is rather increased than abated since, it may be worth while briefly to indicate why the Pope and his advisers did not think fit to reopen the Synod then, and are still less likely to desire it now.

The infallibilist dogma was carried, not without vigorous and very damaging opposition, and has been received throughout the Roman pale, not without murmurs in some quarters and open protest in others, but on the whole with a kind of sullen, half-contemptuous acquiescence. This was the utmost that the innovating party could expect, and even this measure of external success is partly due to a combination of favourable accidents which could not have been foreseen. Among these favouring circumstances must be reckoned first the occupation of Rome, which could not fail, for the moment at least, to elicit or strengthen a chivalrous sentiment of loyalty to the spiritual claims of the pontiff whose temporal grandeur had suffered so rude a shock. That feeling was further intensified by the Franco-Prussian war, ending in the humiliation of "the eldest daughter of the Church" by a Protestant Power, and at once breaking the neck of the French opposition to Vaticanism, which had fought under German leadership, by enlisting all the ardour of patriotic sentiment against everything German. Meanwhile the great standard-bearer of the French opposition, who towered morally and intellectually above his fellows, Mgr. Darboy, had been swept away by the Commune, to the hardly concealed satisfaction of Rome which breathed more freely when he was removed. But the impetus and main strength of the opposing forces had been derived from Germany, where almost the entire episcopate had committed itself beforehand to a rejection of the new dogma and had gone to Rome pledged to resist it to the last. With one or two exceptions they beat a speedy and ignominious retreat on their return from the Council, and one of them, who was both publicly and personally committed to agreement with Döllinger against the dogma, excommunicated him for refusing to accept it. That they lost caste among their countrymen, Catholic as well as Protestant, was a necessary sequel of such conduct. But here help came to the Vatican from a most unexpected quarter. It pleased Prince Bismarck—whether, as he himself alleged, in consequence of the Council, or not—to undertake a crusade against the Roman Catholic bishops and clergy, which to the vast body of their co-religionists all the world over, and to many others also, had all the look of downright persecution. They were challenged, not for submitting to the Vatican dogma, but for maintaining what they had always been accustomed to regard, before just as well as after the Council, as the inalienable rights and liberties of their Church. Only one course was open to them as ecclesiastics or as men of honour—to resist and take the con-

sequences. Some half-dozen bishops have accordingly been fined imprisoned, or deprived; and several hundred—we believe over a thousand—priests have incurred similar penalties. Whether the policy embodied in the Falk laws was or was not a wise and just policy in itself is not the point. If we assume for argument's sake that it has all the justification which its promoters claim for it, the fact remains equally certain that no greater service could well have been rendered to the cause of Vaticanism than this opportune rehabilitation of the German Bishops. The bitterness of the antagonism provoked by the Falk legislation may be measured by the startling news recently given in the German papers, that an alliance offensive and defensive is being formed between the Catholics and the Democratic Socialists, who can have hardly a single idea in common beyond hostility to the existing State.

Here then are some of the circumstances which have conspired to bring about so wide a passive acquiescence in the Vatican dogma. But even so it would hardly have escaped keener criticism, had not submission or indifference been secured by the latitude of interpretation virtually tolerated. From the rigid and consistent ultramontanism of the *Dublin Review*, which invests all the eighty propositions of the Syllabus and a host of earlier Papal decrees on all sorts of subjects with the sanction of infallible authority, to the very different reading of the decree enounced in Dr. Newman's *Letter*—not to speak of still laxer interpretations professed without censure in less influential quarters—there is a very long interval indeed. And Dr. Newman, as well as others, has suggested for the relief of troubled consciences that, although the obnoxious dogma cannot be rescinded, it may be "explained"; and explanation is a very elastic term. The Pope declared on some public occasion that he would not explain it himself, and he showed his discretion by saying so; *omne ignotum pro mirifico*, or, if we may be allowed to coin a word for the occasion, *pro mystifico*, and the mystery is very useful in so perplexing a matter. But if the Council reassembled now, these advantages, and especially the last, might be entirely or partially lost. All the old disputes and heart-burnings would revive, and attention would once more be directed to the bishops in their conciliar capacity, so to speak, and not in their diocesan attitude at home towards their own or neighbouring Governments. Above all it would be about equally difficult to explain the decree or to leave it unexplained. The latter course would give a tacit sanction to the great variety of differing and almost contradictory senses in which it is now accepted as falling within the range of legitimate speculation. To explain would mean either to give an express, instead of a tacit, sanction, to this laxity of interpretation, or to invite fresh opposition and possibly risk another schism by tightening the bond. We may be sure that Pius IX. would never consent to the first plan, and there is probably enough of the wisdom of the serpent in his trusted advisers, if not in himself—and he does not lack shrewdness—to preclude the second. There is another objection of a more vulgar and prosaic but very practical kind to the reassembling of the Council in the present state of Rome. Readers of the *Letters of Quirinus* will not require to be reminded how very efficient a part the Papal police played in the subjugation of the recalcitrant minority. Thus, to take but a few examples which could easily be multiplied, no member of the opposition was allowed to publish a line in Rome, and what was printed on that side elsewhere could only be smuggled into the holy city by some ingenious evasion of the established regulations. The *Giornale di Roma* plainly reminded the Bishops that they were liable to arrest, and could not leave Rome without permission. The whole impression of a work ascribed to Ketteler was seized at the Post Office; some prelates were threatened with imprisonment; and an Armenian Archbishop with his secretary and interpreter was actually incarcerated for a time by the Inquisition, in spite of his appeal to the protection of the Turkish ambassador. It is obvious that with the loss of the temporal power this means of controlling the action of the Council is at an end. The instrument which in Papal Rome required a good deal of manipulation might prove more unruly in the freer atmosphere of the capital of Italy.

Other reasons might be added, but enough has perhaps been said to show the extreme improbability of the rumour that the Pope has in contemplation the reopening of the Vatican Council. That the Synod has been adjourned and not dissolved is no doubt a remarkable fact; and to prelates who, like the late Cardinal Vitelleschi, regard the decrees of 1870 with alarm and disgust and look anxiously for future explanations of what cannot decorously be repealed, it will naturally seem to offer a providential opportunity of escape from a serious dilemma, whenever the time for taking advantage of it shall arrive. But they will be the first to acknowledge that no such opportunity can occur during the life of the present pontiff. All speculation about the person or policy of the successor of Pius IX. is not only premature but pure guess-work. There are no adequate data to form the basis of even plausible conjecture, and it is worse than idle to waste time in twisting ropes of sand. What may pretty safely be assumed is that a Council which has been dragged into committing moral *felo de se*, by abdicating in favour of the Papacy what were supposed to be the exclusive and inalienable prerogatives of such bodies, will not be galvanized into a second and shadowy existence for no intelligible object and at risk of serious inconvenience, by the very authorities who extorted from it this confession of its own inherent futility. Indeed a later telegram only two days ago reports that, in consequence of the declaration of the Sacred College that it is not opportune for the Council to resume

its labours, "the Pope has distributed for study the questions left undecided, with a view to determine if by his proper authority he can solve them." But that point has been already "determined" by the Vatican decree, and Pius IX. is the last person living likely to forget it. Whatever questions may have been left unsolved, it is obvious that the "proper" and the only proper authority for solving them rests with the infallible pontiff.

THE LESSONS OF A LADY HELP.

THE writers of little books on the science of economics have too long neglected the question of servants. One lady has taught her sex how to dress on 15*l.* a year, and another has given us a picture of a delicate girl who, with an income of 400*l.* a year, was always prepared to entertain the six or eight friends whom her husband might casually bring home to dinner. Mrs. Warren, the author of a small but instructive volume now before us entitled *My Lady Help and What She Taught Me* (Houlston and Sons), has heretofore ventured on higher themes. She has written *How I Managed my Children from Infancy to Marriage*, &c., and " &c." may perhaps include a treatise on "How I Managed my Husband from the Altar to the Bier." In her new book she dilates on the vices of servants and the virtues of lady helps, and the work is a very adequate sample of the usual fallacies of this sort of literature. The exemplary mistresses and maids in these little tales always possess all virtue and all knowledge, in addition to iron constitutions and a singularly elastic environment.

"The daughters of the United Kingdom," to whom, or rather at whom, Mrs. Warren dedicates the career of a lady help, are introduced in the opening pages to a Mr. and Mrs. Newton. This pair live in a singular village where there are a great many "offices professing to supply servants," where, at the distance of a few streets, there is "a low-class assembly room licensed for dancing," where the villagers believe in witchcraft, where Mr. Newton has his club, and, in short, where the conditions of urban and rural life are mixed up in a very curious fashion. Mr. and Mrs. Newton have two boys, and keep two servants—a cook and a housemaid. We don't hear that the children had a nurse; and, indeed, these exemplary infants give no trouble, and are never mentioned as affecting the household arrangements. The two maids, when the tale begins, are "regular at prayers, night and morning," but so irregular at everything else that poor Mrs. Newton wishes to engage a lady help. Mr. Newton did not see it; and "this conversation, which took place after evening prayers in a house where the husband's income was sufficient for the needs of a small family of respectability, but who could keep not more than two servants," was interrupted by the entrance of a policeman. The guardian of public propriety announced that the servants were in a low-class assembly room, whither Mr. Newton repaired, and found his maids dancing with "men of the bull-dog physiognomy that he would not have liked as midnight visitors." To dismiss the girls who did not object to men of the bull-dog physiognomy as midnight visitors was with Mr. Newton the work of a moment. But now the troubles of a small middle-class family began in earnest. The lady could "dance and sing"; but these accomplishments, as Homer truly says, are ἀνθήματα δαίμονος, mere embellishments of, not substitutes for, dinner. When Mr. Newton came home with a healthy appetite, he was not satisfied with sitting cross-legged to watch Mrs. Newton dance and sing. His own efforts to engage a servant ended in a disappointing interview with a girl described as a "dormant virago," after which he surrendered himself to whisky and water. The little household was on the way to ruin, when Mrs. Newton again heard of the virtues of lady helps. One friend boasted of "a small delicate-looking young lady, who will dress, punctually, two dinners to perfection. One dinner shall consist of soup, fish, meats, entrées, vegetables, and sweets; and the other a plain dinner, both ready at the same time; and will" (the young lady, we presume, not the plain dinner), "as the clock strikes the dinner-hour, seat herself at the dinner-table, without any indication, except the bloom on her cheek, that she has been otherwise engaged than in pleasant idleness." This was the sort of girl Mrs. Newton wanted, so she secretly advertised for a lady help. We are not surprised to learn that in due time about a hundred letters were delivered at her address. The applications were chiefly of the wailing order; but at last Mrs. Newton heard of a real treasure, the daughter of a chemist, and the niece "of a man who (*sic*), for his scientific knowledge, men were delighted to honour, and who was held in high esteem by his Sovereign." The forlorn lady gladly accepted the services of this distinguished help, who insisted on taking her meals in the kitchen with her underling, a "bright girl" named Ellen.

The two fallacies about the whole question of gentleman helps and lady helps are these—first, that untrained people can perform duties which need long practice; next, that ladies full of knowledge and accomplishments can find no better post than that of a menial. Miss Anna Severn, as described in this tale, could have made an honourable income in dozens of ways without leaving the rank of life into which she was born. She could have lectured on geology at Giron or Merton Hall, at least if we may judge from the scientific remarks which she utters in the kitchen on the topic of "rotten stone." "There is a kind of polishing earth found in Prussia, in a square inch of which there are two billion of shells of insects." Why should this prodigious information have been

wasted on a kitchen-maid, when the eager intellect of English girlhood is pining for lectures and for "instruction by correspondence" on themes of precisely this order? Miss Severn was equally fitted for the duties of professor of moral philosophy, and she quotes, as it seems, from Schwegler, or perhaps from Ritter and Preller, with ready fluency in the solitude of her bedroom. "At all events, I will have no false pride in the matter, and none of that of Diogenes, who, when treading on the rich furniture of Plato, said, 'I trample on the pride of Plato.' Plato justly answered, 'But with greater pride.'" The very highest rank in the profession of education was thus open to Miss Severn, who preferred to teach a kitchen-maid how to wash saucepans, and who gave unobtrusive lessons in botany to her mistress. Here, for example, is a theory of chicory:—"Have you any botanical works in your library? If so, consult them; and, under the head of 'Chicory,' which often grows wild by the road-side, you will find it stated that it is useful as a non-irritating tonic." In the intervals of dancing and singing Mrs. Newton, who probably had no botanical works in her library, could always improve her mind in the society of her invaluable lady help. Miss Severn talked like a printed book, not a mere cookery-book. She might have adorned the chair of English literature and rhetoric, or, if she had chosen the profession of journalism, might have answered the questions of correspondents in a lady's journal. For example, this gifted creature happened once to remark—"Man wants but little, nor that little long" was truly said by Young":—

"You said Young, Miss Severn; surely that oft-quoted line is Goldsmith's?"

"Goldsmith was but a little boy of thirteen when Young wrote his *Night Thoughts*, the line occurs in Night IV., the 'Christian's Triumph.' It is true that Goldsmith borrowed and used it in his Edwin and Angelina, but it is Young's property."

It is not easy to believe that one small head could hold all the facts and figures which Miss Severn knew. Chemistry was not less familiar to her than geology, the history of literature, and the contents of botanical works. Thus, when after "a severe thunderstorm" a duck, "destined provision for the Sunday dinner," showed that painful readiness to be affected by the electric convulsions of nature which proverbial wisdom assigns to the duck tribe—in these sad circumstances, we say—Miss Severn was equal to the occasion. She appeared with "a small pill-box containing some dark chips resembling splinters of garnets." This magical substance was nothing less than permanganate of potash; the remains, probably, of the stock in trade of Miss Severn's father, the chemist. The permanganate soon brought back the duck to its pristine freshness, and the lady help delivered a telling lecture on Condry's Fluid—"for bruises it is inestimable." It is really not surprising that the bright kitchen-girl now suspected the lady help of being a witch, and replied to all sceptical reasoning with the undeniable instance of the Witch of Endor. "Really these low girls are so ignorant and so prejudiced there is no teaching them better things," says one of the characters, rather harshly. Miss Severn ought here to have lectured on Mr. Lecky's valuable *History of Rationalism*, and it is odd that she neglected the chance of using Mr. Matthew Arnold's instructive parallel between Sir Matthew Hale and the contemporaries of the Apostles. But the kitchen-maid packed up her property and fled the house before modern science could be brought to bear on her ignorant attachment to Old Testament history. Miss Severn now set herself once more to her course of botany, and, quoting Dr. Robert Hogg in his *Vegetable Kingdom*, demonstrated that the scarlet-runner is a perennial. For once her mistress was not behind her in erudition, but made play with a dissertation on old French.

We cannot follow all the lectures of the accomplished help, who was rather to be pitied when she had for kitchen-maid "a ballet girl grown too stout for the profession." When Miss Severn was in the drawing-room "this girl was posing in the kitchen, and, with the blind up, was attracting the idle boys of the neighbourhood." Let this be a warning to persons whose establishment is limited to two maids, one of whom passes a good deal of her time in the drawing-room. It is distinctly advisable that the other domestic should not be a conscientious and enthusiastic *danseuse*, yearning for the applause which is the very air that an artist breathes. A figurante is as much out of place in the kitchen as a cook in the drawing-room, or a female Admirable Crichton in the laundry. Indeed the obvious objection to all the fictitious histories of modest, kindly, all-accomplished, wise lady helps is the old rebuke of all Utopias—"The life is hopelessly impossible." The author of this domestic romance very sensibly insists on the utter ignorance of life and of housekeeping in which the daughters of the middle classes are allowed to grow up. They don't know how to make a fire or cook a chop; they spend their youth in learning to play dance-music on the piano, in evading all knowledge of French and of English grammar, and in learning by rote the names of the rivers of South America. Mistresses of this sort make bad servants, and allow good ones to become indolent, untidy, and expensive. It is ridiculous to suppose that girls so trained can ever themselves be useful, or make an honest livelihood, even in a domestic capacity. When their homes are broken up, they necessarily drift hopelessly about, for want of the most ordinary knowledge of life. Novels have not taught them what the world is like, and all that they know they have learned from novels. But, if there is one thing more certain than that girls of this class make slatternly wives, and are useless as servants, it is the fact that women like the ideal lady help do not need to become handmaids. Literature and teaching and business are

open to them; and there are many fields of education besides that cultivated by the despised governess. Miss Severn in real life would perhaps have gone to Turkey and educated the family of a Pasha, with a magnificent salary for her pains. When she came home she would have made her fortune by writing a book called the "Seraglio and the Schoolroom," or by some other taking title. Perhaps she would have remained in England, and gone on from a scholarship at Girton to a professorship in the new Women's College with which St. Andrew's is threatened. Or she would have set up a furniture shop, and taught an eager public the use of the pug dog in decoration, or of the owl in ornament. With this trade she would have combined the editorship of a lady's paper, or the writing of manuals, or of novels, or of histories for children. She would have been rich, comparatively speaking, and independent, and need never have associated with a ballet-girl too fat for the profession or with a stupid and helpless mistress in a distractingly hideous drawing-room. The female Admirable Crichton is born into an advanced and inquiring generation which gives her plenty of liberty and permits her to make almost any experiment. Miss Severn might even have studied anatomy and taken a degree. In France she might have kept a school where the young ladies are allowed to perform mild operations in vivisection. It is more respectable to live in a kitchen and cook salmon cutlets and duck and green peas, but it is less lucrative and less "advanced." The ideal lady help is an impossible character, and incompetent young women of the middle classes will find that they had better learn something of household work for themselves than trust to the chance of engaging such a paragon of servants.

DUELLING IN FRANCE.

THE fact that the French Legislature proposes to deal seriously with the practice of duelling will cause some sensation in Parisian society. Hitherto men have been suffered to do very much as they pleased in this matter, subject to the chance of bodily damage, and to certain contingent responsibilities for gravely injuring their antagonists. To neither of these risks have they given much heed in nineteen cases out of twenty. Honour, by common consent, has been very lightly satisfied; and only unusual awkwardness, or an uncontrollable tremor of the nerves, was likely to lead to unpleasant consequences. Duelling, indeed, had become a fashion, and, though a very foolish fashion, can hardly be said, in the mitigated form it has gradually assumed, to be an unmixed evil. After all, it has exercised a certain beneficial influence in preserving some kind of order in convivial gatherings, and in restraining the savage excesses of political and literary controversy. If there was a general understanding that matters were to be managed comfortably at a "hostile meeting," still there was no absolute security that a gentleman who had been provoked might not take it into his head to act in earnest; while a poltroon with a deadly weapon in his hands might easily become dangerous from sheer fright and agitation. It was a real restraint, therefore, on blusterers that they might have to rise early in the morning to face the possibility of being brought back on a stretcher; and occasionally duels were averted by an apology for irritating language tendered before it was too late. All the same, it is curious to remark how the ordeal of battle in chivalrous France has gradually become a mere caricature of what it used to be. The ruder warriors of the middle ages positively delighted in a trial of strength when the conditions were not glaringly unequal; and when the lists were closed, and the terms of combat arranged, they stood committed to no child's play. If the lances were shivered without doing serious damage, the knights fell back upon swords and battle-axes. Helmets were cloven and shields were rent, till possibly the judge of the lists threw down his staff when one of the mortal enemies was lying helpless at the mercy of the other. Then, if the vanquished escaped death, he forfeited fame, with his horse and weapons, so that he may be said to have lost very nearly all that made the savour of his existence. At a later time, when two-handed swords went out with lances and suits of steel and chain, the custom of duelling, in France especially, became far more common and more frequently fatal. Men of a certain rank and set entered themselves as a matter of course in the schools of arms. When Italy enjoyed almost a monopoly of skill in the noble art, the Milanese and Florentine masters of fence drew their pupils from half the countries of Europe. Frenchmen grew to be outrageously punctilious on the point of honour; and the swagger which is popularly believed to be one of the national characteristics was perpetually furnishing occasions of quarrel. To be ready and able with his weapons was one of the first qualifications of an aspiring courtier; and a man who was climbing the ladder of Court favour had to be perpetually on the defensive against the jealousy of his rivals as he took his stand on each successive step. A careless wiso, a stinging repartee, or a look that was possibly open to misconception, was all that was needful for a *casus belli*. Explanation was embarrassing and difficult even if the parties to the altercation might be supposed to be tolerably evenly matched; it became altogether out of the question when either of them had a decided superiority. Nor were the duties of friendship in those bellicose days by any means limited to making the preliminary arrangements and then looking on and seeing fair play. Most commonly the seconds took their part in the game; and sometimes the Court and the city were excited by the news of set combats between the representatives of jealous factions such as that

fought by the *mignons* of Henry III. At a later period there were privileged corps of guards and of musketeers, black, grey, and green, to whom the thrilling pleasures of the duello were as the very breath of their nostrils. For a somewhat embellished but by no means exaggerated account of those stirring days *vide passim* the pages of the sympathetic Dumas, who was wont to pride himself on his skill as an amateur of the fencing schools. Nor did the adoption of a more modern form of weapon by any means diminish the risks of this exciting amusement. The slender and seemingly more innocent rapier was in reality more dangerous than its ponderous predecessors. The blows of the latter, blunted by shield or mail, might merely knock a warrior out of time, and the leech might heal the ugly hurt which had effectually ended, or at least adjourned, the combat. But the quick lunge of the rapier under the adversary's guard went as easily through the vitals and the arteries as it had pierced the silken doublet; and, till some very material damage had been done, scratches and flesh wounds counted for nothing. The traditions of those early fencing schools have always been perpetuated, although the pistol came to be used alternatively with the small sword in the fire-eating days of the first French Empire. Soldiers who had won their crosses and ribbons in the *mêlée* of the battle-fields with their cavalry sabres and regulation swords stood less on the delicate niceties of *carte* and *terce* than the courtiers and carpet warriors of the ancient monarchy; and when they had been in the habit of making practice with the pistols in their holsters, the pistol came naturally to them when they intended business. In the time of fierce animosities during the allied occupation of the French capital, not a few of the French officers made for themselves a terrible reputation by their deadly practice with the bullet at twelve or fourteen paces.

We have no idea of praising those old times, when men would throw away their lives for a nothing; and of course there is good cause for congratulation in anything that diminishes idle bloodshed. Yet it must strike one as strange that a people so intelligent and so sensitive to the ludicrous as the French should have so long endured a ridiculous parody of a custom that has been handed down to them from barbarous ages. It is true that it is not so very long ago that duelling was put down in England. But duelling in England, even when it was dying out, had an amount of sanguinary earnestness about it that tended to satisfy the intelligence in some sort, while it made suppression doubly imperative. When Englishmen deliberately crossed the Channel to settle a difference, there was a certain seriousness in their expedition. Duelling in Germany has still its absurd side; but the affairs of honour at the German Universities are at bottom mere schoolboy extravagances. Masked, and padded from neck to waist, an active lad can take little harm from a blade that is carefully swathed for a great part of its length; and the worst that happens is that the heroes of the *chôres* have to regret in their later life those disfiguring scars which are the memorials of their college days, while, as respectable fathers and quiet-going men of business, they would be the last to renew the follies of their youth. But in France it is the *crème de la crème* of politics, literature, journalism, and fashion, who are perpetually making themselves a nine days' talk, and scandalizing all sensible people. There is a late supper at the *Café Anglais*, the *Maison Dorée*, or *Peter's*; and a flushed reveller either by accident or design touches some sore spot in the gentleman over against him. There is a burst of party invective from the tribune at Versailles, or a taunting interruption from the body of the Assembly. There is a personal allusion or a coarse imputation in the columns of a party journal. Forthwith the aggrieved person proceeds to sound a flourish of trumpets, and, when he has thoroughly attracted public attention, he demands a public reparation. With a view to making his affair take a satisfactory course, he selects a couple of seconds who understand their business—that is to say, they are to whisper the progress of negotiations to a score of people under the seal of the strictest secrecy; and thenceforth the matter becomes the talk of the *cafés* and theatres, and is freely ventilated in the newspapers. Under the circumstances it is of course difficult or impossible for the other side to retract; so you have all the materials of a pretty quarrel that can only be settled after formal combat. The place of meeting is arranged, either according to the presumed importance of the cause of quarrel, or possibly with reference to the purses of the antagonists. It may be at the convenient wood of Vincennes, when there is no further trouble than is involved in an early drive to a sequestered situation well within rifle-shot of the *Barrière du Trône*. Or it may be worth while to travel beyond the Belgian or Luxemburg frontier, in which case the departure of the bloodthirsty heroes is duly chronicled in the sensational intelligence of the newspapers. In either case there is, almost invariably, a similar ending. One of the parties claims first blood, the points are dropped, the assistants interpose, and honour is declared to be amply satisfied. Even when an obliging surgeon makes the utmost of the scratch, the sufferer, thanks to a vigorous constitution, reappears in a wonderfully short space of time at his familiar haunts, and resumes his ordinary vocations. Often, in consequence of a marvellous piece of good luck, he is in a position to celebrate the vindication of his honour by heroically appearing with his arm in a sling at the breakfast that had been prudently ordered beforehand. And if anything can promote his rapid convalescence, it will be the encomiums he reads on his chivalrous bearing in the journals which he buys on his homeward railway journey, or at his favourite kiosk on the Boulevards.

It would seem, however, as if the French Legislature was at length awakening to the scandal and absurdity of the existing state of things. Hitherto, as we have said, legal penalties have only been exacted in the case of blood-shedding more or less serious. Henceforward the bare act of duelling is to be declared a misdemeanour. Any one fighting a duel may be fined from 4*l.* to 40*l.*, and imprisoned from a month to a year. If he inflicts a wound the fine may be doubled, and the term of imprisonment may be from three months to three years. There are penalties imposed on the sending of a challenge, or on imputing cowardice to the man who declines a challenge. The seconds, too, are to be held as accomplices in the misdemeanour, and consequently they become subject to the minimum punishment; while the duellist who kills his man is liable to banishment for a term of from one to five years from within a six-miles radius of his victim's residence—a provision which may well make fellow-citizens hesitate before pushing their quarrels to such perilous arbitration. Although these penalties can scarcely be said to be severely prohibitory, they may at any rate be expected to have some deterring influence. Many of those Parisian *viveurs* who are rapidly devouring their scanty patrimonies may have been willing to seek a new sensation in an affair of honour to be carefully conducted on the most strictly humanitarian principles; or they may have felt that the risk of a little blood-letting was a very moderate set-off against the certainty of a passing notoriety. But it will be quite another thing when they have to stint themselves in their dissipations, or borrow at cent. per cent. to pay a fine, with the prospect of being sent to prison in default. Many a struggling journal, trading on scandal and invective, may have considered it a paying form of advertisement to keep a fighting contributor to accept the responsibility of a calculated provocation. But it may seriously disturb the delicate equilibrium of its budgets if the treasury is liable to an unlooked-for drain each time that it sends a champion into the field. So, on the whole, we may welcome the proposed law as decidedly a step in the right direction, although, should it really prove a check upon duelling, we may, on the other hand, have some misgivings as to its effect on unbridled tongues and unscrupulous pens.

FEDERALISM AND DUALISM.

WE were amused the other day by seeing in a daily paper an allusion to certain "theoretical politicians who have lauded Federalism as the most perfect form of government." They are "recommended to study the working of dualism in Austro-Hungary at the present moment." The recommendation is a good one for any one, whatever may be his notions about forms of government, as the present dispute between Austria and Hungary is instructive from all points of view. But we are curious to know why these supposed theoretical politicians should be sent to learn the lesson rather than anybody else. And we are still more curious to know who these theoretical politicians are. We are told, indeed, that their "arguments are generally paraded in Home Rule debates." It is not clear whether this means that the theoretical politicians themselves take a part in Home Rule debates, or that those who do take a part in Home Rule debates quote the arguments of the theoretical politicians. It does not very much matter. The things to be noticed are the facts, or alleged facts, that there are some people of some kind who have lauded Federalism as the most perfect form of government, and that their arguments are by some people or other believed to have some bearing on Home Rule.

Now it is certain that any one who should laud Federalism as the most perfect form of government must be a very theoretical politician indeed. This proposition is in truth only part of a larger one. Any one who lauds any form of government as in itself the most perfect must be a very theoretical politician indeed. Such a one may, for aught we know, be found among those who take part in Home Rule debates; we are sure that none such will be found among scientific students of comparative politics. For such students go by the evidence of history, which is exactly what theoretical politicians pay no regard to; and the evidence of history teaches before all things that no form of government can be said to be the best in itself, but that any form of government may either be the best or the worst, according to diversities of time and place. Least of all would any practical politician, any one who has studied the working of human affairs both in the past and in the present, think of lauding Federalism as the most perfect form of government. For, while no form of government can be said to be in itself perfect, a form of government which is in its own nature intermediate, perhaps transitional, which is in any case a compromise between two extreme doctrines, is least of all fit to be set up as the most perfect in itself. It would be much more natural to set up as a perfect ideal either of the two states of things between which Federalism steers a middle course. Zealots for great centralized dominions in all times and places, and zealots for small independent commonwealths in all times and places, would both of them come under the head of theoretical politicians; but the zeal of both of them would be intelligible. It is less easy to conceive any one having the like zeal for the intermediate state of things, that is, for the federal relation. All that those who have studied and written on the subject of Federalism have ever said has been that Federalism, like any other form of government, may be the best, as it may be the worst, in this or that time and place. All that they have ever said has been that

groups of political communities are sometimes found whose circumstances are such that they are more likely to prosper if they are united together by the intermediate relation of Federalism than if they are either left wholly distinct or joined together by a closer union. No one that we ever heard of has said that this intermediate relation was the best for all times and places—that, in short, it was the most perfect form of government; but only that it was the best for some particular times and places. And they have further said that, if States united by a federal tie should at any later time think good to make a more perfect union, it would be no argument against the federal system, but rather an argument for it. For it would show that the federal relation had done its work by preparing the way for a more perfect union in a case where such a union could hardly have been brought about without going through the intermediate stage. And they have further said that, when Federalism has worked well, it has been when it took the form of more perfect union, when its work was to join together bodies which were wholly apart, not when it sought to dismember a body which was already more perfectly joined together. So far they may perhaps be thought to have reason and experience, the guides of practical politicians, on their side. They certainly have nothing whatever in common with those theoretical politicians, if any such there be, who laud Federalism or any other form of government as in itself the most perfect in all times and places. Least of all have they anything in common with that particular class of theoretical politicians who are alleged to see some connexion between Federalism and Home Rule.

But whether there are such people or not, the line of thought which is suggested by their supposed existence may not be a useless one. It may be worth while to point out that the actual relations between Austria and Hungary and the proposed relations between Great Britain and Ireland have very little in common with federal relations strictly so called; and further to show that there are important points of difference between the case of Austria and Hungary and the proposed case of Great Britain and Ireland.

The case of Austria and Hungary is not a case of a real federal union at all. It is at most a case of imperfect Federalism, an approach to the thing, but not the real thing itself. Like other cases of the union of two independent kingdoms under a common king, as Sweden and Norway, or as Great Britain and Ireland from 1782 to 1800, it has thus much in common with a federal union, that there is a relation established which is something between complete union and complete separation. But there is no such systematic working out of the federal principle as there is in the Confederations of Switzerland and America, or even in the Imperial Confederation of Germany. In the days of the Irish experiment modern constitutional theories had not advanced far enough for any one to think of a separate responsible Irish Ministry. But that refinement appears in its fulness in the relations between Austria and Hungary. The only tie between the two countries would be the common sovereign, if it were not for the device of a delegation from each of the independent Legislatures of the two countries. But these delegations do not form even a real Federal Executive, much less a real Federal Legislature. The Federal Legislature, an essential element in any fully developed Federal Constitution, is lacking in the dual relation of Austria and Hungary. A theoretical politician who held that Federalism was everywhere the best form of government, if he were called on to learn greater wisdom by contemplating the Austro-Hungarian system, might fairly answer that his theory was in no way touched by any failure of a system which lacked an essential feature of his ideal form of government. He might even say that the dual system, instead of being his best form of government, had just that kind of likeness to it which might entitle it to come under the rule that "*corruptio optimi est pessima*." In truth, the failure or success of the dualistic system proves nothing one way or another as to the merits of a federal system. The two things have that faint degree of likeness which is implied in both being different from a third thing; but there is not that degree of likeness which justifies any one in arguing from one to the other either for praise or for blame.

The absence then of any real Federal Legislature, of any real Federal Executive, is quite enough to distinguish the Austro-Hungarian dualism from any true federal system. But the fact that dualism is dualism is really quite enough of itself. That instinct of primitive speech to which we owe the dual number shows a feeling that, if the difference between two and three is not quite so wide as the difference between one and two, still the difference between two and three is a difference of another kind from the difference between three and four, five, or a thousand. The ancient rule, "*Tres faciunt collegium*," comes in here. It is hard to see how a true federal system could be worked with so few as two members. If one of the two is much stronger than the other, the federal union will be a sham, as the larger State will have it all its own way; if the two are nearly equal, there is a chance of a constant deadlock. If you have three States, you can get a majority, and the thing may possibly work; but of course a much larger number will work better. It might not be impossible to change the Austro-Hungarian monarchy into a real Confederation, and real federal ideas have not been unheard of in some parts of it. But such a Confederation would not consist of Austria and Hungary as its only separate members. It would embrace, as separate States, all the kingdoms, duchies, counties, lordships, and anything else, which a series of accidents have so oddly tacked on to the Austrian archduchy and to the Hungarian kingdom. Such an assemblage of States might have a real Federal Executive and a real Federal Legislature, while

each State had its own Cantonal Executive and Cantonal Legislature. We do not undertake to say whether such a scheme would or would not work in practice. All that we say is that it is ideally possible, and that such a scheme would be a real Federal Government, and might prove something about the working of Federalism, while the Austro-Hungarian dualism is not a federal system, and can prove nothing about the working of Federalism.

Again, the origin of the Austro-Hungarian dualism is quite different from the origin of any real federal system. The real federal systems of the world have arisen by separate States seeking for a more perfect union. In the Austro-Hungarian case, the Kingdom of Hungary had been for many years held and ruled in an utterly illegal way by the ruler of Austria. The dualism began, not by forming a closer union, but by dissolving a union which was too close. The Austrian Archduke, hitherto merely the tyrant of Hungary, became her lawful King. Federalism means union partial but not complete, union for some purposes but not for others. Dualism means separation partial but not complete, separation for some purposes but not for others. So in the case of Ireland, the proposal of the Home Rulers is not a proposal in the direction of Federalism. A real federal union has been made in Canada, and has been talked of in Australia. But Home Rule means, not the partial union of several distinct bodies, but the partial division of a single body. The wisdom or folly of the Hungarian system, or of the Irish scheme, must be argued on quite other grounds, wholly distinct from the defects or merits of federal systems. There is no reason why even the imaginary idolater of Federalism should be called on more than another man to take warning by Hungary or to beware of Ireland. There is still less reason to apply such a warning to the man who does not hold that any form of government is best or worst in itself, and who holds that Federalism, like any other form of government, may be best or worst as may happen.

Lastly, there are some important points of difference between the Hungarian case and the proposed Irish case. The dualism of Austria and Hungary arose as a medium between an illegal absorption of Hungary by Austria and a complete separation of Hungary from Austria; it is the dualism alone which secures to Hungary any political rights at all. But Ireland is not, as Hungary was before 1866, held in bondage by Great Britain. It is simply part of the same kingdom with Great Britain, part of a kingdom in which no one part has any special privilege over any other part. Ireland had, indeed, wrongs in times past; but it is hard to see what her wrongs are now. Hungary needed dualism to give her any constitutional government at all; Ireland has constitutional government as it is. The Irish member, the Irish elector, are under no disadvantage as compared with the English or Scotch member or elector. Some theories of Home Rule have indeed proposed to do something very like making Great Britain a dependency of Ireland. The English and Scotch members were not to vote in Irish matters, but the Irish members were to vote in English and Scotch matters. Hungarian dualism is not Federalism, but there are manifest reasons for its existence. Irish Home Rule is neither Federalism nor Hungarian dualism. If it has any arguments in its favour, they must be arguments quite different from any which can be brought to support the state of things which exists either at Bern or at Pesth.

FRENCH IMPRESSIONS OF LONDON.

NOT very long ago we had occasion to speak of an outrageously ridiculous French novel the scene of which was laid in England, and in so doing we remarked generally upon the strangely false notions of English life commonly entertained among French people. There is, however, something to be said on the other side. M. Bellenger, who has lived long in London and written about it a book called, without any apparent reason, *Londres Pittoresque*, points out that grossly mistaken views of French life are entertained by many worthy Englishmen, and that this is the fault of the numberless *feuilletons de joie* started under the Second Empire, for which the author of the book evidently has little love. He thinks it not unnatural that English people should readily accept the views offered to them in these publications of another country's customs; for these are represented in the blackest possible colours, and an Englishman reading of such things may congratulate himself "that he was born a happy English child." "Oh! as to the youth of your country," a man will say who knows France only through the kind of writing which came into fashion under the Empire, "we know all about that; we read about it every day in your journals. The young men of France are given up to ignorance and conceit, and have inherited all the vices and none of the virtues of their fathers. As to the people, they are a set of idle drunkards." No doubt a man who rested his opinion of French life upon the information of *Le Figaro*, of the younger Dumas's representations of Parisian society, or the abominations which M. Zola has grovelled to pick up in the gutters and muck-heaps of Parisian slums, might readily enough come to such a conclusion. Putting aside the truth or falseness of these representations, the answer, says M. Bellenger, which a Frenchman is tempted to make to an Englishman bringing these charges against his country is, "If our ways are so worthless and corrupt, why is it that you constantly imitate them? Why do you constantly borrow from us the very vices which you condemn with holy severity? It is true enough, for instance,

that the French stage has fallen upon evil times, and that playgoers delight in such stuff as *La fille de Madame Angot* or *La Jolie Parfumeuse*. But remember that English writers rush to translate these wretched things, and that you may see them going on at two or three London theatres at once. I will admit all your propositions if you will grant that you are in as bad a condition as we are, with this difference, that, as invention fails you, you borrow our follies and set them up for admiration. "Ne leur dites pas cela," prudently observes the author, "ils seraient furieux; contentez-vous de le penser dans votre for intérieur, et surtout soutenez-leur *mordicus* que les infâmes calomnies mises en circulation par les *feuilles de joie* françaises chères à M. Builet et concernant le peuple de Paris sont d'effrontés mensonges. Le peuple français, pris dans son ensemble, est plus travailleur, plus économe, plus vertueux que tout autre peuple, n'oublions jamais cela."

M. Bellenger himself has at least, it will be seen, the virtue of patriotism in a marked degree. And it is no doubt this virtue which has caused him to fall into the error for which he rebukes Englishmen, of exalting his own country at the expense of another, without inquiring too closely into the facts on which he forms his judgment. After the burst of admiration for the French people just quoted, M. Bellenger proceeds to clear his countrymen's minds, once for all, of the absurd notion they have long entertained about "le *comfort* Anglais." It is true, according to him, that there is much comfort and luxury among the rich, who have *mansions* either in town or country, and it is from the reports of French travellers who have been entertained for two or three days in such houses that the foolish ideas about English comfort have arisen. The author admits that such travellers were treated with the greatest possible kindness, but cannot resist adding with a sneer that this was because they were regarded as "de bêtes curieuses." But when you come to "le menu peuple" of England, a very different order of things presents itself. And, in the first place, the habit of early marriage, due to the absence of a conscription, leads to a result which will strike many French fathers and mothers with horror. As soon as a youth of sixteen or seventeen has got some employment in a trade, business, or shop, by which he can just cover his expenses, he abandons his family altogether, hires some poorly furnished room, and boards partly with his landlord. It is indeed a shocking state of things that young men should so early become independent and make a living for themselves. But let us see what kind of a living it is, so far as eating and drinking are concerned. In return for the youth's payment to his landlord he gets morning and evening a cup of tea and a thin slice of toasted bacon. At one o'clock he dines at a coffee-house off some form of fried meat and rudely cooked vegetables. As soon as he has swallowed this meal, never varied from year's end to year's end, he rushes to the public-houses and gulps down glass after glass of beer. If he is a bachelor, and given to good cheer, he adds to these meals a supper of fish, which he buys at the corner of a street, and eats standing up. To sum up, says the author, it may be said that in England lodging is very bad and eating is detestable, unless one is rich enough to indulge in the luxury of a French cook. M. Bellenger was evidently unfortunate in his experiences, and has as clearly fallen into the trick, which it seems impossible for a Frenchman writing about England to avoid, of mixing up different sets of facts in inextricable confusion. At the same time it would no doubt be an excellent thing if the cooks of London coffee-houses could take a lesson from "the most economical and virtuous people in the world." And the contrast which the author of *Londres Pittoresque* points between the French cabaret and café and the English public-house may no doubt be advantageously attended to, although in his treatment of this matter national prejudice plays some part. The Paris workman, says M. Bellenger, has been often taxed with intemperance because he sometimes goes into a wine-shop "pour tuer le ver ou boire un canon." A man who has lived in England can only smile at this ill-natured accusation, for a Parisian drunkard would easily gain a temperance prize in London. This daring statement may be at once dismissed as a mere blast of *chauvinisme*, with the following observation—that drunkenness reigns supreme throughout the United Kingdom as much in the houses where the nobleman or the rich merchant intoxicates himself decently, as in the public-house where the wanderers of the streets get drunk without any thought of concealing their shame. However, it is no doubt true that the French café has vast advantages over the English public-house. The café is called by M. Bellenger "la maison de ceux qui n'en ont pas," and the title is not undeserved. It offers in many ways the attractions which are to be found only in clubs in England; "le pauvre vient y passer la soirée l'hiver pour économiser sa bougie et son chauffage: le passant las s'y repose; on s'y donne rendezvous pour conclure une affaire; on y entre écrire une lettre, lire les journaux. La boisson n'est que l'accessoire, beaucoup de gens partent en laissant leur verre à moitié plein." This is all very true, and it is also true that the public-house, where the sole attraction is strong drink, or where at least no one can find refuge without making strong drink an excuse, presents a terrible contrast to the café. But, with some disingenuousness, M. Bellenger has passed over the cabaret with scarcely a word; and it may be questioned whether the cabaret will compare very favourably with the public-house. The eau-de-vie and "vitriol" drunk in the cabaret are perhaps no worse than the gin and brandy supplied at the public-house; but they are certainly neither better nor less deadly in their effect. M. Bellenger

speaks with scathing indignation of the fact that women as well as men drink in England, as if it were an entirely unknown thing in France, and tells his readers that in the higher as well as the lower classes the vice of drinking is only too common. "Le nez rouge des Anglaises est célèbre, et ne s'est point colorié tout seul." English ladies drink secretly; they keep whisky in their cupboards and in their pockets; they disguise gin and brandy by putting them into bottles labelled as medicine or eau de Cologne. Whether there is any foundation for this or not, we seem to have heard of certain milliners' shops in Paris to which ladies were attracted not only by the brilliant silks and satins displayed to their eyes, but also by bottles and glasses discreetly kept in a back-shop and brought out for established customers. We may further remark that, while this French writer severely rebukes the English noblemen who, according to him, are in the habit of quietly intoxicating themselves at home, he says not a word of that state of semi-intoxication common enough among respectable people in France which comes from too great a resort to the stimulus of "le vin blanc."

From this subject we may pass to lighter matters which occupied M. Bellenger's attention while he lived in London. Among these that of door-knockers is not without interest. It seems that the art of knocking at a door "en gentleman" is by no means easy to acquire. "Le vrai gentleman exécute sur le door-nail, à l'aide du knocker, une vraie performance musicale." And the art is, though difficult to learn, so easily recognized that at the sound of the true gentleman's knock the laziest and most insolent of servants will rush to open the door. If, on the other hand, the knock misses the touch which only high-breeding can give, none of the servants will move from the kitchen. "Si vous êtes là" (how did M. Bellenger come to be there?) "et que vous exprimez votre surprise, le servant vous répond en haussant les épaules. *Pooh! it's but a man, not a gentleman!*" The author kindly gives a word of advice to those who may be ignorant of the true art of knocking. "If you cannot knock like a gentleman, the only way to get the door quickly opened is to give a postman's knock, which consists of two sharp and almost simultaneous raps upon the door-nail." M. Bellenger treats of various other matters of everyday London life in the course of his book, and constantly finds occasion to recur to his great charge of drunkenness. For instance, his account of Christmas and Boxing Day is that Christmas Day is not unlike the Fête des Rois. Only the brutal Englishman, instead of becoming gay, like the Frenchman, over just one glass too much, never knows when to stop, and goes on drinking until he falls underneath the table. On Boxing night the streets present a terrible aspect, which is not perhaps unnatural when it is considered that on this night the police shut their eyes to every kind of disorder, and "le *fun* anglais se donne carrière." Windows are broken, bells and knockers pulled off, street-lamps extinguished, and no one interferes until the next morning, when quantities of sleeping drunkards are picked up by the police and the crossing-sweepers. These things being so, it is not strange that M. Bellenger should prophesy a terrible rising some day of the London mob, the effects of which are too dreadful to contemplate. M. Bellenger, in spite of his long residence in England and generally correct knowledge of English names, has collected impressions worth about as much as those of the *feuilles de joie* which he decries with bitter scorn.

THE UTILIZATION OF THE DEPOT CENTRES.

WHEN the arrangements for the establishment of the depot centre system were first set on foot, there was a good deal of misapprehension in many quarters as to the exact scope of the measure. The common notion appears to have been, even among those who might have been credited with an easy comprehension of such things, that it was part of a scheme in contemplation for localizing the army, and that the depot centre was to become the head-quarters of the two linked battalions associated with it; and it would seem to be sometimes thought that the scheme was a failure, because it has not led to results which were never expected from it. The regiments connected with the different centres will not in ordinary course ever be quartered there in peace-time, while these stations would be the very last places to select as rallying points on the emergency of war. All that was contemplated by the establishment of these depot centres, as regards the infantry of the Line, was that every regiment should have a fixed instead of a movable recruiting depot; that the same depot should serve for two battalions, one of them being always abroad and the other at home, and the recruiting being common for the two battalions. There is an obvious advantage in this partial amalgamation, as it admits of a battalion on service being fed with soldiers from its twin battalion at home. Another and prominent feature in the scheme was the establishment of the head-quarters of one or more militia regiments at each depot centre. It was hoped that recruiting would be stimulated by the permanent location of the depot of every line regiment in a district of its own, the recruits from which would naturally choose the regiment which they were best acquainted with, while the plan might serve in some degree to remove the discredit which the roving military life not unnaturally suffers in the estimation of the working population. It was considered, too, that a sort of tie would thus be formed between the line regiments and their associated militia, though it is not easy to say precisely in what

the tie consists. Finally, the depot centre buildings were very useful for the head-quarters of the militia, who were in most parts of England much in want of such conveniences.

Whether the realization of these simple aims was worth the cost they involved is probably an open question even among the authorities who have been charged with the duty of carrying out the scheme. But there can be no question that the measure would have been positively mischievous, if the country had been misled into supposing that it constituted any sensible advance towards creating a system of national defence, whether that defence is to take the form of passively awaiting invasion within our shores, or the more active and effective one of distracting the enemy's attention by counter attack against his own. In either case the first element of the matter is the provision of the means for rapid mobilization; and this the depot centre system does not in the smallest degree advance. At most it will help to bring in recruits more readily, and militiamen wanting to volunteer for the regular forces will know beforehand to what regiment they are going. The actual scheme of mobilization is altogether apart from this, and is neither sensibly aided nor impeded by it. That scheme is indeed but little better than a paper one at present; but meanwhile, pending the next step—if it is ever to be taken—for carrying out some of the more obvious and pressing parts of the general plan lately made public, there is no reason why the depot centres, as they have been built, should not be turned to the best possible account. And the Committee whose Report has just been submitted have proposed some measures in this direction of considerable importance.

One difficulty always urged when army reformers attempt to propose reductions in our much over-officered army, is that arising out of the detached employment in remote parts of the world to which our regiments are subject. To meet the strain which this kind of service involves, the establishment of regimental officers must be kept up at a higher figure than it is admitted would otherwise be necessary. Now one obvious way of meeting this difficulty would be to render the officers of each couple of linked battalions mutually interchangeable, so that the battalion abroad might draw on the sister battalion at home for experienced officers to fill its casualties. This has always been the practice in those regiments—now the first twenty-five of the Line as well as the Guards—which consist of more than one battalion. But when it is proposed to apply it to the linked battalions of different regiments, then regimental traditions come into play, and some authorities, the Duke of Cambridge among them, consider that a serious blow would thus be inflicted on the service through its *esprit de corps*. An officer, they urge, should never be required to serve except with his own regiment. The Committee, however, effectually turn the flank of these objectors by proposing that the respective pairs of linked regiments which now have a common depot should no longer be kept as separate bodies, but should be absolutely united as one regiment. This proposal, which necessarily involves a large reduction in the existing number of line regiments, is no doubt very bold from one point of view. The general impression would certainly be that its name and number are the distinctions especially dear to the regiment, and the last things about it which ought to be tampered with. But the Committee point out that, as a matter of fact, the numbers and names of regiments have undergone at different times very numerous and frequent alterations. The Rifle Brigade, for example, earned their Peninsular reputation as the 95th; and not only have regiments been re-numbered, they have been disbanded and reformed again after a long interval, the newly created regiment inheriting nothing but the name to which it succeeds. During the Seven Years' War the regiments of the line were increased to 145—a monstrous arrangement of course. One half the number would have given a much more convenient distribution for the number of enlisted men; but it was done to find employment for officers and colonelcies for Court favourites. After the war the regiments of the line were reduced to seventy, at which number they remained until shortly before the revolutionary war, when a small augmentation was made for India, followed shortly afterwards by a general re-numbering of those which stood last on the list. As to the supposed repugnance of the men and officers to the change, we should be disposed to value this objection no higher than the Committee do. There is nothing about his regiment which a soldier so soon forgets as its number. Take the present 101st, for example, which distinguished regiment won all its fame during nearly a hundred years of active service as the 1st Bengal Fusiliers. What soldiers do attach importance to are the distinctive honorary marks which most regiments possess. The tendency of recent administration has been to do away with some of these class distinctions, we think unadvisedly. In the 7th Fusiliers, for example, all the sub-alterns used to be appointed at once as full lieutenants; and, inasmuch as the arrangement did not advance their promotion to captain beyond that of other regiments, the distinction, although much appreciated, did no one any harm. So, too, the Rifle Brigade used to have second lieutenants instead of ensigns; but the equalizing process of late years has swept away these small privileges without any corresponding advantage. The Committee, however, propose that all existing regimental badges and honorary and honourable distinctions shall be carried by each regiment with it to its new designation; while, by substituting territorial names for numbers, the difficulty about changing numbers will be entirely obviated. If, for example, the present 100th Foot were to be renumbered as the 70th, it might be difficult to say whether the

prestige attaching to the latter number remained with the new regiment or was carried away with it by the old one; but the proposal now put forward gets over this difficulty by abolishing numbers altogether. Henceforward the regiments of the line will be known, as are the Grenadier or Coldstream Guards, not by numbers, but by names, such as the Royal Derbyshire or the Northumberland Fusiliers. It may be hoped that this will serve to give the different counties a specific interest in their own regiments.

But, although this measure has been ostensibly proposed in order to utilize the depot centre system, it really goes much further than this. By a side wind it does away with a grave defect in our existing organization—the excessive multiplication of cadres. A large number of weak cadres in peace-time may be very well, if there are reserves in proportion; but every one knows that these reserves will never be forthcoming in our army to anything like the extent necessary to bring up the skeleton regiments to a reasonable strength. We should be fortunate if we could manage on an emergency to maintain our infantry regiments at the nominal war-footing of 1,000 each; but an establishment of regiments whose war strength only reaches that number gives a very expensive organization; an establishment of seventy regiments for the British line, organized in two battalions is a much more suitable force for any strength of rank and file we are likely ever to have than the present establishment of 110 regiments. The Committee, therefore, whether by intention or chance, have certainly laid open one of the grave blots in our army organization, while simultaneously proposing an effective remedy. The present excessive number of military units is an obstacle to reform which meets one at every turn.

The Committee deal to some extent with the militia organization as well, but their proposals on this head are by no means so full and thorough as those we have been noticing. His mode of handling the militia organization was the weakest part of Lord Cardwell's treatment of army reform. The admission of officers to the army through the militia was of course intended merely as a sop to the Lord-Lieutenants of counties, to compensate them when taking away the control of this branch of the service. The effect of the arrangement has been just what was foretold; the men who enter the line from the militia make use of this channel as a last resource, after failing in the regular examinations; their brief sojourn in the militia confers no benefit on it, while they can bring no advantages to the regular army. The time has come when this well-meant but mistaken plan may with advantage be superseded by something more rational. But, in fact, the whole question of the militia organization requires to be taken up quite as much as that of the line. The present mode of raising and maintaining it, while excellently adapted to the conditions of the country, needs to be supplemented by considerable changes in the mode of supplying the officers. You cannot exact more military service from the men than is given now; but, just in proportion as they are necessarily inferior to the regular troops, is the need for efficiency in the officers. Raw troops with veteran officers to lead them may be made efficient in a very short time; but, if the officers as well as the men are inexperienced, the difficulty is enormously increased. Instead, therefore, of the militia supplying officers to the line, the gift should be the other way—the line should furnish officers to the militia. A plan for doing this in a systematic way is urgently needed. So long as the purchase system was in force it might have been difficult to carry it out; the officers when leaving the army took their money with them, and became their own masters; but now, when the difficulty is to know how to get rid of the officers fast enough, and the Government are at this very time considering what bounties and inducements shall be held out to induce retirements, the obvious means for helping to maintain the due current of promotion, which transfer to the militia might be made to offer, ought certainly to be taken into consideration. It might, for example, be made a condition of retiring on a bonus, such as it is in contemplation to offer after only a few years' service, and to officers in the prime of life, that the recipients should serve for a term of years with their associated militia regiments. However, this is not the place to go into details; we must be content here with drawing attention to the importance of the subject.

The Committee recommend that the commandant of the depot centre should be specifically connected with the regiment to which the depot belongs. Here they have touched on another weak point in the present arrangements. If the proposed fusion is to be satisfactory and thorough, the man at the head of the amalgamated body must not be merely an elderly officer who has taken the post in order to pass a few years of quiet in one place. The commandant of the depot should be the most important personage in the regimental hierarchy. A late writer in *Blackwood* pointed out some of the inconsistencies involved in the want of a substantive rank of colonel in our service. Why, he asked, should all colonels be brevet-colonels, any more than all majors and all captains be styled brevet-majors and brevet-captains? He might have cited a strong instance in point from these depot commandants. From the nature of the case they must always be colonels, and it is simply absurd to style them lieutenant-colonels, there being no colonels commandant or other superior to whom they could be even nominally subordinate. Clearly these officers should be substantive colonels. The change might with advantage go still further. The commandant of the depot centre should be the colonel, not only of the depot, but of the whole territorial regiment, militia as well as line, rising to the office in regular course from

the command of one of the line battalions. The title of lieutenant-colonel would then be appropriate (which it is not at present) for the officers commanding the latter, for they would then really be, as in Continental armies, lieutenants or deputies of their colonel. The latter, stationed at head-quarters, would occupy the most dignified and important post in the regiment. Under him would come all the recruits, both men and officers, for training. The distribution of the latter to the different battalions would be made by him, and his office would serve as a bond to keep the whole regiment together, while nothing would be better calculated to promote the desirable end of bringing about a fusion and identity of interests between the associated battalions of the militia and the line than to furnish them with one common head.

DEAN STANLEY AND SIR ROGER DE COVERLEY.

NO speaker under the rank of one of the leaders of Government or Opposition should be so sanguine as to expect that any speech that he makes will be reported as he spoke it. As there is no chance of the report giving what he really said, he is perhaps most lucky when the report gives the exact opposite to what he said. In that case there is the chance that some readers of the speech will have the wit to apply the rule of contrary, and so to get at something like his real utterance. The intermediate state, where there is enough likeness to the real utterance to pass for it, but where the point is blunted, the style spoiled, the minuter details hopelessly mangled, is much more grievous. One incompressible trick is to take down word for word the first half of a carefully prepared sentence, but for the second half to substitute some lame and impotent ending of the reporter's own. Translation of the speaker's English into the reporter's jargon must be taken for granted. He speaks, for instance, of "hard to get in," and it is translated into "difficult of access." A joke is of course carefully left out; a speaker should not so far forget himself as to make jokes. The audience may be weak enough to laugh; but the reporter is a graver being, and will not record the folly of either speaker or audience. Then, again, there is the chance that the reporter may know just enough of the subject in hand to make mistakes. Thus the other day a speaker, in holding forth on the great subject of the day, made some strictures on the conduct of Sir Henry Bulwer a good many years back. In the report the actions of Sir Henry Bulwer were attributed to Sir Henry Elliot. Here utter ignorance would have been better than half knowledge. A reporter who had never heard of either Sir Henry would have put down the right name if he caught it, and no name at all if he did not catch it. But a reporter who had heard of Sir Henry Elliot, but had not heard of Sir Henry Bulwer, took for granted that any Sir Henry who was mentioned in connexion with Eastern affairs must be the only Sir Henry that he had ever heard of. No one can make many speeches at public meetings without suffering many things of many reporters, without seeing himself turned into many shapes which he himself would never have thought of. Still all these things must be borne and may be borne. The really hard case is when a thing is quoted and repeated and commented on which not only never was said, but never was reported.

The Dean of Westminster has plainly suffered grievously at the hands of the reporters of his late speech about Caxton. We are, as we shall presently show, somewhat puzzled about a passage which seems to be genuine; but there is a great deal which we feel sure is due to the reporter and not to Dr. Stanley. We are sure that Dr. Stanley never talked about "the Abbot of Islip, who was very nearly the last of the great abbots." This is rather like the Bulwer and Elliot story. It is a case of the reporter knowing just a little too much. He must have known that Islip was the name of a place, and he did not think that the name of a place could also be the name of a man. When therefore Dr. Stanley spoke of "Abbot Islip," one of the best known Abbots of Westminster, the reporter at once founded an unknown monastery out of hand, and turned him into "the Abbot of Islip." A little further on we come to a passage in which we really wish to know what Dr. Stanley said. He is made to say, after mentioning the Almonry of Westminster,

It is further identified by us that this Almonry was over against St. Ann's Chapel, which is a place generally known from a comical story in the *Spectator* under one of Sir Roger de Coverley's letters, where he goes up and down the streets after the declaration, asking first for St. Ann's Chapel, when he is rebuked by the Puritans, and then for Ann's Chapel, when he is rebuked by the Cavaliers, and eventually only undertaking to ask the way to "the Chapel."

A good deal of this is pure gibberish. We are sure that Dr. Stanley never uttered the first six or seven words, and that he never talked about "under one of Sir Roger de Coverley's letters." This last phrase reveals the existence of an odd state of mind on the part of the reporter, who clearly looked on Sir Roger de Coverley as a writer of letters. Surely there cannot be some lurking confusion with Sir Roger Tichborne. But what we do want to know is about St. Anne's chapel. Did Dr. Stanley really say anything about a St. Anne's chapel, and, if he did, what did he mean by it? In the story in the *Spectator* there is nothing about St. Anne's chapel, but only about St. Anne's lane. As the tale is told by Addison, it runs thus:—

This worthy knight, being then but a stripling, had occasion to inquire which was the way to St. Anne's Lane; upon which the person whom he

spoke to, instead of answering the question, called him a young Popish cur, and asked him who had made Anne a saint? The boy being in some confusion inquired of the next he met, which was the way to Anne's Lane; but was called a prick-eared cur for his pains, and instead of being shown the way, was told that she had been a saint before he was born, and would be one after he was hanged. "Upon this," says Sir Roger, "I did not think fit to repeat the former question, but going into every lane of the neighbourhood, asked what they called the name of that lane." By which ingenious artifice he found out the place he inquired after, without giving offence to any party.

Here is nothing whatever about a chapel, only about a lane, nor is there anything to connect the story with Westminster. The only St. Anne's lane known to the Postal Guide is in the City, near St. Martin's-le-Grand, once, though not in Sir Roger's day, a neighbourhood no less ecclesiastical than that of the Abbey. Can Dr. Stanley have mistaken so plain and so well known a story, or have translated it from St. Martin's to St. Peter's? It is not like a story of which there could be some other version somewhere else. The *Spectator* is quoted, and there are surely no acts of Sir Roger de Coverley recorded by any other authority. It would be rather a stretch of ingenuity for a reporter to turn a lane into a chapel; still that might happen to a reporter who had been listening for some while to talk about abbeys, almonries, and other things, among which a chapel might seem more at home than a lane. But would a reporter have dreamed of the manifest connexion in which the story, as here told, is put with the abbey of Westminster and particular parts of it? It is passing strange if the reporter has so elaborately misunderstood Dr. Stanley; but it is almost more strange if Dr. Stanley has so elaborately misunderstood Addison. Anyhow we are not sorry that between them they have made us read over again one of Addison's best stories told in his best manner. It would be a pity not to go on to the end of the paragraph, and muse on Sir Roger's own comment on his youthful adventure, though it certainly takes us far away from Caxton and Westminster Abbey:—

Sir Roger generally closes this narrative with reflections on the mischief that parties do in the country; how they spoil good neighbourhood, and make honest gentlemen hate one another; besides that they manifestly tend to the prejudice of the land-tax, and the destruction of the game.

LORD PENZANCE'S SALARY.

AS far as the ostensible object of the Ecclesiastical Offices and Fees Bill is concerned, Mr. Cross's statement that "the more he had looked into the subject, the more convinced he was that, so far as the Ecclesiastical Courts were concerned, they were in that position in which all institutions found themselves which had remained unreformed for a considerable period of time," may be accepted as bearing the stamp of his good sense and experience. This is no doubt true so far as that arrangements of very old standing which were suitable in past generations are in some respects not very well adapted to present wants and conditions; and that there is room for a reasonable revision, in which, without rushing wildly into innovations and shabby reductions, certain offices may be brought more into accordance with modern convenience. And, as the Bill stands, it is identical with its predecessor of last year, of which the Archbishop of Canterbury was the sponsor, and is a very plausible and innocent-looking measure; and calculated to satisfy those who are not acquainted with what may be called the subterranean aspects of the project. In the first place, is it really what it professes to be? On this question some curious light is thrown by an incautious disclosure which was made in August last by Dr. Tristram, Chancellor of the Diocese of London, in a letter addressed to the various Chancellors and Registrars of dioceses throughout the country. This startling circular revealed the fact that "the chief object of the Bill" was not, as it pretended to be, the revision of an old system with a view to give it greater efficiency—this being, in fact, only a pretext and disguise for the measure—but, as Dr. Tristram, with a full knowledge of the facts, frankly avowed, "to provide the means of providing the Provincial Judge with a salary of 1,500*l.* a year, with a salary for his secretary, and a sum for court expenses." It also suggested that, "as that object is necessarily unobtainable"—that is, through the withdrawal of the Bill—"a Bill similar to, and not better than, the late one may be brought forward next year, unless a means can be found in the meantime which would make such a measure unnecessary." The obvious meaning of this is of course that the real purpose of the Bill was to scrape together a salary for Lord Penzance in a quiet way, without having a distinct vote of the House of Commons on the subject; and that, as the reforms proposed as a cover for this would probably not be convenient for a certain class of officials, those officials would find it worth while to shelve the Bill by subscribing out of their salaries the amount required for the Judge. The letter explained that Lord Penzance, who is to be the Provincial Judge under the Bill, and is also Dean of Arches, then received a net payment of only 610*l.* from the Mastership of the Faculties and other offices, and that a balance of 890*l.* was required for "the sustentation of the Provincial Judge," with a further sum of 100*l.* for court expenses, and 200*l.* per annum for the Judge's secretary; and the writer added that he had "reason to believe that, if the Chancellors and Registrars of the various dioceses were to agree to provide this balance, no further movement in the direction of the Ecclesiastical Offices and Fees Bill" would be made, and that Mr. John Hassard, the lately appointed Principal Registrar of Canterbury, had nobly offered to surrender 20 per

cent. of his newly acquired income, on his own estimate of it, as a contribution to the maintenance of the Provincial Judge. It may be presumed that this manner of settling the question would not be so unprofitable to the official in question as a scheme of reform; and other officers of the same kind probably took a similar view. On the other hand, however, there seems to have been a difficulty in squaring the job by private co-operation, and hence the uncomfortable revival of a Bill on the subject. It is obvious that the disclosure of this secret plot has a very important bearing both on the sincerity and the value of the proposed legislation.

Mr. Cowper-Temple, who now has charge of the Bill, in moving the second reading, remarked that the question of the reform of the law relating to Ecclesiastical Courts had occupied the attention of the Legislature for a long series of years; that the law rested on nearly a hundred statutes, and that no fewer than eleven separate attempts to legislate in the way of amendment had been fruitlessly made. It is possible that the existing system may be capable of a certain amount of revision and improvement; but Mr. Cowper-Temple's account of the failure of past attempts to deal with the subject justifies the impression that it is a very difficult one to settle, and that, when looked into, many of the changes proposed are as likely to do harm as good. Moreover, the Government has steadily refused to take any responsibility in such a delicate and complicated matter, and, in spite of Mr. Cross's admission, prefers to leave it in the hands of a private member. It will also be observed that Mr. Cowper-Temple attributed the break-down of previous Bills to their attempting to deal at one stroke with so wide and difficult a subject, "which it was impossible to set right in a single Session"; and this remark of course equally applies to the present measure. On the whole, then, it may be suspected that all that is hoped for by the promoters of the Bill is to shuffle in a provision for the Provincial Judge which the Government is ashamed or afraid to attempt openly in the regular way, and to leave the other questions to the future. Mr. Cowper-Temple, in fact, intimated as much when he said "he was sure the Government would deal with the Bill in an indulgent spirit, that they would give it full consideration, and pass as much of it as they might think merited their support." There can be little doubt that the part of it "which merits their support" will be found to be that which helps them out of a difficulty in providing for the payment of Lord Penzance's judicial services—a point which, as will be recollected, ignominiously broke down when the Public Worship Regulation Bill was before the House of Commons.

Upon this point two observations may be made. In the first place, if a new Judge is established by Act of Parliament, the salary to which he is entitled ought to be provided in the ordinary way out of the national resources, and not by subsidies squeezed from his subordinates by fear of reforms which they naturally dislike, or exacted from them—or from the laity out of the price they pay to get married, and from the clergy out of the price which they pay to get inducted—by a legislative tax. The expectant bridegroom, thirsting for his licence, has no desire to see its price enhanced in order to provide contingent facilities for sending the vicar to prison who is to make him happy, while the clergyman who has to go through the less pleasant parts of the process which is to make him an incumbent would resent as an insult the suggestion that he is at the same time contributing to his own possible deprivation. It is also plain that in one aspect any such arrangement would place the Judge in an utterly false position in relation to the officers whom he is expected to supervise, but on whom he is in fact dependent for an income. Indeed the plan would come very distinctly under the category of the "commissions" which have been lately so much exposed. Mr. Raikes undoubtedly expressed the opinion of every fair and impartial man when he said that he was at a loss to conceive why the salaries of hard-working clergymen in country towns should be diminished in order to furnish the salary of a public functionary; and in suggesting that the expense should be borne either by the nation at large or by the Archbishops and Bishops who had "clamoured" for the appointment of the Judge, to suit their own views. Mr. Beresford Hope also pointed out that the question was whether the 52nd Clause providing charitable relief for the Judge was the essential part of the Bill, and the rest merely padding, as had been asserted by so competent an authority as Dr. Frisstram; and that the subject of fees, which was mixed up with an unfortunate and acrimonious controversy, was not to be determined simply by the amount of money involved.

Under these circumstances, nothing could be more unreasonable than to expect the House of Commons to pass such a Bill, with no better introduction than that of a private member, without inquiry; and the Government therefore felt compelled to agree to the question being investigated by a Select Committee. Practically, however, the value of such an inquiry will be neutralized if the Committee is required to form its judgment on offhand statements devised to further underhand purposes, and entirely unsupported by any substantial evidence. It is probably true that, as Mr. Cross said, if the whole subject is to be thoroughly gone into, and witnesses summoned from all parts of the country, the result will be the loss of the Bill; but the obvious remark on this is that the loss of a Bill which shirks the most important part of the question with which it professes to deal, and which is based on purely *ex parte* views and objects, would be rather an advantage than otherwise. The remedy is in the hands of the Committee, in the liberty which it will enjoy, according to the

forms of the House, to ask leave to take evidence on certain points, and those who desire a fair and lasting settlement of the question must desire that it will use its powers boldly and broadly.

ST. MARTIN'S PORTICO.

THE House of Commons has in a quiet way done a very sensible thing, and the Metropolitan Board has done what is next best—retreated unconditionally from the perpetration of a very foolish one. This august and busy body is big with a gigantic scheme of intersecting London with a system of broad new streets, one of them observing generally a north and south line, and proceeding from the Tottenham Court Road end of Oxford Street to Trafalgar Square, roughly parallel with, but east of, Regent Street. Against this scheme nobody can have a word to say; it is plainly a great London convenience, and may, or may not, be made a great ornament. But there lay hidden a fly—a very bloated bluebottle—in the ointment. The breadth of the street was fixed at sixty feet—a judicious proposal where there was no special reason to be urged against it. Unluckily, for a few feet at the absolute bottom of the new street that width could only be reached by the hopeless mutilation of an architectural monument which not England only, but the whole world, has long accepted as a masterpiece of Italian architecture—the portico of St. Martin-in-the-Fields, built by Gibbs between 1721 and 1726. Judiciously for the interests of Vandalism, the name of the doomed building did not appear in the Bill; but there were little unostentatious powers of taking "steps" and what not, which would have betrayed the church into the hands of the destroyer. This portico, as all who know London must be well aware, owes its beauty, not less to the stately proportion of its pillars than to the broad, well-graded, and pyramiding basement of steps from which the superstructure rises. The proposal of the Board was to shear off this essential feature, to replace it by successive sections of steps skulking between and behind the columns, and to tilt these columns up upon ungainly pedestals. Whenever the scheme was mentioned, publicly or privately, in clubs, in society, in newspapers, there was but one opinion of this most indefensible Vandalism. The Vicar and churchwardens and the parishioners of St. Martin's were in arms. Still, there lurked the proposal in the masked powers permitting the accomplishment of the ugly havoc. At last the day of the second reading drew on, and a member put down the only possible form of opposition at that stage to a private Bill—namely, rejection of it as a whole. No one wanted to see the great plan of streets in all quarters of the town hung up for a year; but in no other way could the attention of Parliament be concentrated on this particular grievance, and some relief obtained. The general feeling of members had never been more conspicuously unanimous, and of this Sir James Hogg and his Board were not unobservant; and so, when the order was called, he got up frankly and freely to abandon without condition the obnoxious proposal. Attention was called in the course of the conversation which followed to the forgotten fact that, when Trafalgar Square was first laid out, the regular rectangular plan on which it was originally intended to build it had been given up simply and solely to bring St. Martin's portico into view; so that it would have been rather strange if this age, which plumes itself on its art progress, had consented to destroy that which its ruder forefathers of William IV.'s days had exerted themselves to place in honourable prominence. The incident is of good omen now that the Ancient Monuments Bill is so soon to be considered. While we have always supported Sir John Lubbock, it was not because we think that the rough remains of prehistoric days claim an exceptional protection which should be denied to the forms of beauty bequeathed by civilized ages. But these early relics happen now to occupy a Parliamentary as well as a natural precedence. The principle of preserving them and of preserving St. Martin's portico is the same, and we hail the emphatic recognition of it on the part of the House of Commons.

REVIEWS.

WALLACE'S RUSSIA.*

THE interest excited by the opportune appearance of this book is not diminished by the consideration of its origin and its objects. The author has neither crammed for his work, nor did he undertake a journey to Russia for the express purpose of writing a pamphlet which should expand into a volume. He visited the country before the Franco-German war, and found so many things to interest him that he spent nearly six years in acquiring a knowledge of the language and studying the condition of the people. In the summer-time he lived with priests in obscure villages, or paid visits to country houses, or attended the meetings of "Local Boards." In the winter he enjoyed society at St. Petersburg, Moscow, or a third town, Yaroslaf, which lies a hundred and fifty miles or so to the north-west of the old capital, and contains, the map tells us, more than twenty thousand inhabitants.

* *Russia*. By D. Mackenzie Wallace, M.A., Member of the Imperial Russian Geographical Society. 2 vols. London, Paris, and New York: Cassell, Petter, & Galpin. 1877.

Here, then, was the foundation of an excellent work; and when we add that Mr. Wallace seems to be gifted with the happy knack of interpreting the thoughts of foreigners, that he never but once got involved in the least dispute with the officials, that every kind of information, social, official, and scientific, was readily placed at his disposal, and that he has made a capital use of his time and materials, we need hardly say that we are calling attention to something very different from the holiday tour or the political ramble the notes of which grow into a neat volume, illustrated by photographs of greasy Muscovites and by coloured maps showing the progress of Russian aggrandizement since the days of Peter the Great. The book, in fact, is one which taxes to the utmost a reviewer's powers. It is difficult to condense or analyse nine hundred pages treating, with many others, of such vast questions as the imperial administration, the emancipation of the serfs, the rise of local institutions, and the character of the clergy. The style is clear, animated, and fluent. We have only found two words—"torrential" and "optimistic"—to which the most fastidious critic could object. It would have been well, however, had Mr. Wallace added to his knowledge of Russian and German a slight tincture of Oriental literature. He would then have perceived that what he calls a *metchet*, or "a Mahomedan house of prayer," can be nothing else than the Arabic *mosjid*, which Tasso transformed into *meschita*; that *arbut*, a water-melon, is not Tartar, but the Persian *khar-buza*; and that *Okhoun*, "a minor officer of the Mahomedan ecclesiastical administration," is really an *Akhund* or religious preceptor. The *Akhund* of Swat, on the North-west frontier of India, is familiar to many readers. But we cannot impute blame to such an author for not knowing more of Russia in Asia when he has given us such ample information about Russia in Europe; and even his flying visit to the pastoral tribes of the Steppe, where he saw the Kirghiz, and was feasted on mutton, salt horse, and fermented mare's milk, is by no means without its interest. Some of the information is thrown into the form of dialogues with peasants, doctors, and landed proprietors, and it is one of his good qualities that he never labours to be funny and facetious on these occasions. The language is natural; the situations are humorous, but not forced; the pictures of stolid peasants awakened out of their lethargy are amusing, and his accounts of village squabbles, of the easy-going proprietor, the parish priest, and the retired martinet, carry with them their own testimony to fidelity of portraiture. Descriptions of such comparatively well-known cities as St. Petersburg or Moscow are judiciously cut short or altogether omitted. Even the fair at Nizhni Novogorod is hastily dismissed; but on most other topics, journalists, politicians, members of Parliament, and cultivated readers will find much to solve doubts or to stimulate inquiry. We should have been glad of a chapter on climate and its rapid and extraordinary changes, and on agriculture and products; but this, we gather, is, with other matters, reserved for a future work. Of the finances we are merely told that they are "sound," an announcement which will be gratifying to the holders of Russian stock. But there can be no question that Mr. Wallace, at a crisis which he could not have anticipated, has given to the world a description of the most important half of a huge Empire, which is excellent in conception, scholarly in arrangement, and unexceptionable in style.

No person who has been accustomed to handle Indian subjects can fail to perceive the frequent points of resemblance between Russia and our Asiatic dependency. Some of the conversations might be put into the mouth of a Hindu cultivator; and several of the descriptions, by a slight change of language, would apply to a district in Behar or the Doab. In Russia, as in India, bridges are seen standing far away from the stream which they were intended to cross, or divorced from the road which had originally led up to them. Russian families, like Hindus, live together with a sort of joint-stock management; the gains of enterprising members, in both countries, are claimed for the common fund; and the management of household affairs not seldom falls into the hands of a person whose claims rest on force of character, and not on seniority. In Russia he is called the *Khosain*; in Bengal, the *Karta*. In the former country marriages are arranged between young people by a functionary termed the *Swakhi*; in the latter by a class known as *Ghuttucks*. If the introduction of machinery and capital has extinguished domestic industries in axes and nails amongst the peasantry of the North, the muslins of Dacca are half extinct, and the looms of Hindu and Mussulman weavers have been put down by piece-goods from Manchester and America. In both lands conservative habits, innate credulity, and the subterfuges by which the weak cope with despotism, have produced precisely the same fruits. Men convicted of flagrant dishonesty are not banished from a society of which most members under like temptation would have done the same. If the marriage of the Duke of Edinburgh gave rise to a rumour that a large number of young maidens were to be sent to England in a red ship, either for a female conscription or to recruit the ranks of English spinsters, similar occasions have in India sent the most extravagant rumours flying like wildfire through a hundred bazaars. If a *muzhik* or peasant finds his life irksome or his landlord too oppressive, he seeks refuge in flight, and so do thousands of Hindu and Mahomedan ryots. In both countries the agricultural classes are largely in debt to the village banker; in both there is the same rooted antipathy to scientific ploughs, improved machinery, or new-fangled implements. The peasantry of the Northern zone as marked out by Mr. Wallace, and the hill-men of our Eastern frontier, think nothing of preparing a small plot of forest land for agriculture by kindling a destructive fire. Russian and Hindu

village communities, it has been shown by other writers, have survived dynasties, stood out against oppression, and preserved some of the elements of self-government; while native judges pocket bribes, and juries acquit criminals on the Ganges and on the Volga, in the teeth of evidence with a quiet conscience. The mention of these failings, which are inevitable under a system where half-educated judges draw small pay and are exposed to temptation, leads on to an excellent chapter in the second volume on the judicial procedure and the law courts. We here learn that the administration is in the hands of Justices of the Peace, and of higher Courts of two kinds; one comprising several districts, and the other, or the Appellate Court, extending over several provinces. The Justices of the Peace decide both civil and criminal cases of a petty character, and there is a right of appeal to the Assembly of Justices. In the other class of tribunals, the higher Court is more one of Revision than one of Appeal. There is a Minister of Justice, who also acts as Procureur-General, and whose subordinates are bound to protect society, to look after the helpless, and to repair "infractions of judicial order." The judges are not credited with a deep knowledge of law, or with the calmness and common sense which often supply the place of learning; and the advocates are loquacious, discursive, and by no means immaculate. But the new system, which dates from the emancipation of the serfs and is partly copied from the French, has worked better than Mr. Wallace might have expected. There are some interesting remarks on the prevalent kinds of crime and the estimation in which they are regarded. Assaults and charges of cruelty are treated leniently; and wife-beating is hardly looked on as an offence. To make up for this, a Russian jury is very hard on persons charged with arson, robbery, and theft, as we may expect where rural police are few and wooden houses are easily entered or set on fire; nor can jurors understand why a scoundrel should get off because he can hire an eloquent counsel, or because there is a small link wanting in a strong chain of legal evidence. Mr. Wallace has been in America, but not, as far as we see, in India or the East; but had he lived for six years in our Imperial dependency he would hardly have employed different language if deputed to report on trial by jury, and on the law amendments made by Sir H. Maine and Sir J. Stephen in the Bengal criminal code. The unconsciousness with which Mr. Wallace shows up like moral defects, propounds similar remedies, demonstrates the difficulty of teaching a population accustomed to a paternal despotism to bestir and govern themselves, and suggests at every other page the analogies of Indian life and the aims of British philanthropists, lends, from this point of view, an additional interest to his valuable work.

But we should do scant justice to the author if we omitted all notice of the past and present condition of the peasantry, to which several chapters in both volumes are devoted. A large, but not undue, space is given to the *Mir* or Commune, and to the emancipation of the serfs. It seems that a certain portion of the land in a village is common property; and that the members of each household, on their allotted portions, cultivate independently but pay into the common treasury a certain fixed sum. But this independence of action is subject to certain clear limitations. Ploughing and mowing must commence on days fixed by the village assembly; the insolvency or drunkenness of any single individual affects the interests of all, and cannot go unpunished; no one can leave his village for good until he has discharged all his liabilities, or even work elsewhere without a written permission, because the land is held jointly, and because "all households are collectively and individually responsible for the dues of the Imperial Treasury." It seems, too, that this taxation is imposed, not on the extent of the land, but on the number of persons in the village, and that a census is taken periodically, and the amount calculated after revision, on the increase or diminution of souls. The land is distributed by the Commune to each household according to its working power; and amusing instances are given of attempts on the part of individuals to be responsible for only so much cultivation, as well as to evade the obligations of office. But the reader will bear in mind that in the South, where land is fertile and taxes are light, the peasant wishes to take as big a share as possible. In the Northern zone his feeling is just the reverse. A still more primitive feature, inseparable from the division of land into homestead, arable, and pasture, is that no share can be compact or contiguous. On the contrary, no household can have less than four separate plots, because one big piece is meadow and another arable, and this latter must be parcelled out in strips to meet the triennial rotation of crops. The annual allotment of these strips gives rise to much discontent; but we are distinctly told that in the end no one, however aggrieved, ever thinks of disputing the decision of the assembly. In fact, the Commune is a big farm held by a joint-stock company of peasants, the members of which cultivate separately, but under certain rules, and with a clear and distinct recognition of one joint responsibility and one common aim. The parallel of India need only be suggested here.

Readers who have followed us thus far in a sketch of Mr. Wallace's full and suggestive exposition may wish to know how the Communists maintained their ground against the landholders, and whether there was any difference between Communists and serfs. This is to be gathered from the second volume, in which the condition and treatment of the serfs and their emancipation are spread over several chapters. According to a native author, in old times the rural population was made up of a class of slaves, recruited by war, crime, and insolvency, of free labourers, and of peasants properly so called. By the eighteenth century all these distinctions had disappeared, and there remained nothing but a

single class of serfs, who either belonged to the nobles and proprietors or to the State. Very soon both the Czar and the proprietors found it necessary to attach the cultivators to the soil, and to prevent them from changing their domicile. From this coercion to patriarchal jurisdiction, to corporal punishment, to fines, and to the sale of slaves apart from the land, the transition was natural and easy. How this system led to oppression and cruelty on the one hand, and to discontent, vagrancy, and local insurrections on the other; how emancipation was talked of and played with by one Emperor after another for nearly a century; how the peasants of the Communes, paying their dues to the Czar, became serfs to all intents and purposes like those on the estates of proprietors, but enjoyed more of land and liberty, and were less exposed to violence; how some serfs had the privilege of working elsewhere for money, and paying a yearly sum to their lord; how the liberality of a kind master raised one set to a condition above the typical Dorsetshire labourer, while the fierceness of a tyrant drove others in despair to the most frightful retaliations; is told by Mr. Wallace with much care, and with ample illustration. That, apart from the serfs of the soil, there was a distinct class of domestic servants, who had no land, who received no wages, and had no legal rights, we have been reminded by the charming play of the *Danischeffs*. Of the noble measure of emancipation Mr. Wallace seems to have taken a just estimate. He is alive to its moral greatness, its new disturbing and economic forces, and its excellent effects on indolent and thoughtless proprietors; but he sees clearly the extravagant expectations with which it was heralded, and the complicated problems to which it has given birth. Indeed those who study Mr. Wallace will easily understand that it required something more than an Imperial decree to transform slaves into free peasants, possessing each a house and a garden; to draw a clear line between the communal land and the rest of the estate; to fix the price to be paid to the proprietor for the communal property, and to leave him to cultivate the rest as best may be; to arrange that within a limit of two years domestic servants should gain their freedom; to overcome the hostility or repugnance of the nobles; to convince the serfs that they had got as much as they could expect, or as, in the present state of feeling, it was in the Czar's power to grant. Yet the thing was done, and without bloodshed, save on three occasions, when the military had to be called out, in one instance killing some fifty peasants and wounding many more. It is creditable to the nobles that they responded to the call of the Emperor, as well as to certain functionaries appointed arbiters for the settlement of numerous disputes that they discharged their tasks with impartiality and integrity, and without bribery. Of course all things did not go smoothly at first. The peasant did not know how to use his freedom of action; the proprietor could not see his way to cultivating his estate without forced labour, though Mr. Wallace shows that this difficulty was got over in one of four ways. Of course also prices rose, expenses increased, contracts were not fulfilled, the laws of demand and supply could not at once replace patriarchal discipline, and ruin overtook some proprietors, while there was no counterbalancing elevation of the agricultural class. All this is set forth dispassionately and fully; but we arrive at the conclusion that all such great reforms must be accompanied by injury to some classes; that time and friction will work wonders; that, on the whole, the good preponderates over the evil; and that the evils would have been tenfold had emancipation been longer delayed.

We are sensible that this is not an outline of the Magna Charta of the *Muzhik*, and there are several other chapters which are scarcely less suggestive. The accounts of the Russian Church and its connexion with the State, of the Dissenters and the Ritualists, not to be confounded with the fanatics and heretics, of the mercantile classes, of the nobility, and of the local self-government, deserve careful study. We must here observe that Mr. Wallace condemns the practice of giving churches as dowries to the daughters of priests. This means that when a priest dies his living is settled, so to speak, on his family. The bishop intervenes, selects a suitable young man, marries him straight off to one of the daughters, and inducts the bridegroom afterwards into the benefice. But this practice, we have been informed, is no longer allowed. Some readers may be disappointed in not getting from so competent an observer an exhaustive survey of Russia's exact place in the political world, and an estimate of her power to meet Continental nations in the field or to absorb effete and corrupt Mahomedan States. From the concluding chapter it is clear that Mr. Wallace is no alarmist. He neither underestimates the force of events which impel the Russian forward, nor does he ascribe to him an insatiate ambition, which, if he had it, financial embarrassments, internal difficulties, and the gradual growth of public opinion must tend to curb. But the book is all the more valuable for not dealing too much with the Eastern question. It gives us just that information which enables us, with a little trouble, to form an independent judgment for ourselves. The intentions of the Czar are not to be gathered from the spiteful articles of a half-emancipated press at St. Petersburg, or from the vapourings of officers tired of the inaction and heat of Khiva and Tashkend. What Russia can do depends on her agricultural development, her financial solvency, the extirpation of old abuses, and the growth of new wants; and Mr. Wallace has contributed largely to the elucidation of these topics by two volumes in which ample information, thoroughly digested, is brought under the discipline of a dispassionate judgment, and is set forth in perspicuous and manly language.

COCHRANE'S HISTORIC CHÂTEAUX.*

MR. BAILLIE COCHRANE'S historical writings always remind us of the Countess d'Aulnoy's fairy tales. His favourite kings and princes are invested with something of the grace and fascination of the Roi Charmant or the Prince Guerrier, and seem almost as unreal as those adorable beings. His accounts of State ceremonies, Royal meetings, and the like, sound like extracts from *Gracieuse et Percinet*; he revels in galleys with sails of purple and gold, in bonfires and salvoes of artillery, in wreaths of roses and lilies. His style may best be described as "sweetly pretty." "The fair fiancée"; "her court of grace and loveliness"; "never was bridal accompanied by more fervent benedictions"; "the abode of light, of love, and enjoyment"; "the ladies of that bright Court, where the approval of ladies was decisive of merit"—such are the graceful phrases scattered with a lavish hand. Lulled by the gentle murmur of soft-flowing sentences, we give ourselves up to the illusion, believe ourselves in that delightful French fairy-land where the heroes and heroines are all persons of quality; and not even the shock of the concluding tragedies—for two murders, and a military execution not very distinguishable from murder, form the staple of Mr. Cochrane's present work—can quite awaken us. At the present time we are not exactly in the mood to complain of this effect of *féerie*. We read so many scientific historians nowadays; we are so weary of the growth of institutions and the progress of the people; we have had it so dinned into our ears that history should not be a record of the personal adventures of kings and queens, that we find it refreshing for a change to turn to a writer who has an unregenerate liking for royalty, and lays it down, without fear of contradiction, that "the death of a king must ever be an epoch in a nation's history." The king after Mr. Cochrane's own heart is, as those who have read his *Historical Studies* need not be told, Francis I. His enthusiasm for that prince is fresh and strong as ever. For him he is still "the chivalrous, high-spirited monarch, beloved by France," possessing "the universal sympathies of the people," and exercising, it would seem, the most beneficial influence upon those who surrounded him. "During his youth he had introduced into the Court every fashion that tended to raise and elevate society." We can only ask in wonder what glamour has been cast over Mr. Cochrane that he cannot see the ugly reality that underlies the superficial glitter? The Court of Francis I. to the eye of the historian resembles that of the Fairy Queen in Scottish legends. When the enchantment is removed, the elfin knights and ladies on their prancing palfreys are seen to be loathly goblins and hags astride of withered branches and kail-stalks. The service rendered by Francis to society mainly consisted in showing it how to dress up its vices to the best advantage.

The "Historic Châteaux" which Mr. Cochrane has chosen as pegs to hang his discourses upon are three in number—Blois, Fontainebleau, and Vincennes. While speaking of the first, he takes occasion to utter his protest against the brand-new painting and gilding which has been somewhat profusely bestowed upon the interior, and the consequent destruction or concealment of much of the old work:—

The taste of modern restoration has, within the château itself, ruthlessly destroyed much that was interesting to the historian and the artist; many of the rich arabesque patterns, the sculptured wood-work, the frescoes, and dimly lighted stairs and passages have been what is called restored, but, in fact, have been sacrificed to the spirit of innovation; the state apartments have been redecored, and many an interesting record of the past has been buried for ever under gilt and plaster; heavy timbered roofs, darkened by centuries, have been painted blue and dotted with stars; brilliant colours meet the eye in all directions; the fleurs-de-lis, the love-knots of Catharine and Henri, the salamanders of François I. are all regit; and too little is left to the imagination, there is no longer the "light that half conceals the beauty it reveals," for many a window has been enlarged, and the old stained glass replaced by modern designs. Stamped leather covers walls formerly divided into panels, each of which contained a different moulding; but all this gorgeousness and extravagance has failed to destroy the grandeur and interest even of the interior.

Each of these three châteaux serves as an excuse for recounting the history of some striking events or persons connected with them. The Duke of Guise, who is to Blois what Rizzio is to Holyrood, shares with Catharine of Medici the central place in the first of Mr. Cochrane's historical sketches; Fontainebleau suggests the murder of Monaldeschi by order of Christina of Sweden; and Vincennes the sad fate of the Duke of Enghien. Of these sketches we are inclined to think the last the best, as being written in a quieter and more natural style, though Christina of Sweden and her eccentric doings may perhaps have the charm of novelty to many readers who are sufficiently familiar with the history of the Dukes of Guise and Enghien. The murder of Guise, indeed, though retold for the hundredth time, can never fail to be an impressive scene. There is a ghastly mixture of the grotesque and the horrible in the picture of King Henry listening within his closet to the sounds of the death-struggle, and only venturing forth when he knows that all is over, and that his mighty foe is prostrate at his feet. "*Mon Dieu, how tall he is!*" says the King, as he looks down upon the corpse of the stately Duke—a curious instance of the trivialities men sometimes utter under circumstances of strong excitement. Mr. Cochrane has related this famous scene with simplicity; but his tendency to fine writing ever and anon gets the better of him:—

The Angel of Death seemed to have spread his wings over France.

* *Historic Châteaux: Blois, Fontainebleau, Vincennes.* By Alexander Baillie Cochrane, M.P. London: Hurst & Blackett. 1877.

Shadows, clouds, and darkness rested on the land; but the day of a terrible reckoning was at hand, and two weeks after, on the 5th of the following January, Catharine de Medicis died, and in August of that same year, the dagger of Jacques Clément vindicated the foul murder of Henry, Duke of Guise.

The *Spectator*, it may be remembered, in expectation of the Peace of Utrecht, warned the poets who intended "to show their talents on so happy an occasion" that "I shall not allow the Destinies to have had an hand in the deaths of the several thousands who have been slain in the late war, being of opinion that all such deaths may be very well accounted for by the Christian system of powder and ball." So the deaths of Guise and his brother the Cardinal may be sufficiently accounted for by the poniards and halberds of Henry's faithful servants, without having recourse to the Angel of Death and his wings. To lead up to the murder scene we have a passage worthy of the *Mysteries of Udolpho*—it might describe Montoni in one of his most melodramatic poses:—

The night of the 21st of December, 1588, was at Blois dark and gloomy. During the day the wide landscape of hills and dales, the plain rich in its cultivation, the rapid Loire and tributary streams, had looked beautiful even through the pale gleams of the Winter's sun. Towards evening the black masses of clouds portended a storm. The moon, as it rose, shone fitfully on the tall white donjon tower, with its deep, round-headed windows; each angle of the ill-omened feudal castle stood forth in relief, while the heavy buttresses cast their shadows across the terrace called La Perche, where Le Balafre was walking. There were watchers below, to whom he was an object of interest. They observed that he was gesticulating in a wild, excitable manner; his step, usually slow and dignified, was hurried and uncertain. At moments he would pause, fold his arms, and seem wrapt in thought. The dark flow of the rapid river, and the wind whistling through the battlements, were the only sounds that broke the stillness of the night. What ambitions, what projects, what hopes, what fears were chasing each other across the mind of the great Duke, even as the clouds were chasing each other across the pale moonlight!

Mr. Cochrane may have authority for all this, including the whistling wind and the driving clouds; but we cannot help suspecting that it has been developed out of a scene described in less poetic fashion by Miron, the physician of Henry III. Guise on that occasion did walk up and down the Perche for more than two hours, "agité d'une bouillante et merveilleuse impatience"; but it was in the *après-dînée*, not by moonlight, and the date was November 10, more than a month before his assassination, and not, as in Mr. Cochrane's story, on its very eve.

If Guise is the most striking and dramatic figure among the victims whose fate Mr. Cochrane narrates, the Duke of Enghien is the most deserving of pity. True, the young Prince showed no great wisdom in fixing himself so near the frontier, even though love, and not ambition, was in reality answerable for his choice of residence. In vain his grandfather wrote from London, begging him to take care of himself. "Vous êtes bien près . . . ne négligez aucune précaution pour être averti à temps et faire votre retraite en sûreté, au cas qu'il passât par la tête du Consul de vous faire enlever." The letter is curious as showing that as early as June, 1803, the possibility of such a stretch of Bonaparte's power had been present to the minds of the Bourbons. The Duke's mysterious comings and goings gave some colour to the accusations against him, though the alleged visit to the Strasburg theatre, which Mr. Cochrane treats as a certain fact, is contradicted both by Enghien's own correspondence and by the testimony of the Baron de Saint-Jacques, who was attached to his household. "Il faut me connaître bien peu pour avoir pu dire ou cherché à faire croire," wrote the Duke to his grandfather, "que j'aurai pu mettre le pied sur le territoire républicain autrement qu'avec le rang et à la place où le hasard m'a fait naître." But, though his imprudence did not go the lengths represented, Enghien, drawn to Ettenheim by its nearness to the abode of his unacknowledged wife, heeded no warnings till it was too late, and was still hovering on the frontier like a moth round a candle, when the flame caught him. Whether the First Consul honestly persuaded himself that Enghien was an accomplice in a murder plot, or whether he simply meant by one sudden and terrible stroke to frighten the Bourbons and their partisans into quiescence for ever, is a disputed point, upon which Mr. Cochrane does not seem certain of his own mind. At least he first says, "It was impossible that for one moment the First Consul really believed that the Duc d'Enghien was a party to it [the conspiracy of Georges], or that he ever visited Paris"; and then, a few pages further on, he admits that Bonaparte "persuaded himself, by the very violence of his emotions, of the truth of the reports he had received as to the presence of the Duke at all the meetings held by Georges and the other conspirators." Those who make out a defence for Napoleon in this matter are driven to represent their hero as somewhat deficient in courage and dignity. A man who believes in his "star" ought not, on the approach of personal danger, to work himself into a state of nervous excitement which deprives him of his judgment. There is, however, reason to suspect that in truth Napoleon was not guilty of any such weakness. Mr. Cochrane quotes, seemingly without doubt, the statement of M. Thiers that, after ordering the Duke's arrest, the First Consul "ne dicta presque pas une lettre"—exaggerated in our author's translation into "he did not dictate one letter"—"pendant les huit jours de son séjour à la Malmaison," presumably by reason of his mental agitation. Unfortunately for this theory, M. Lanfrey avers that in those eight days twenty-seven letters were dictated, seven of them on the very day of the Duke's arrival at the *barrière* of Paris, when the First Consul's "agitations ont dû apparemment être portées au paroxysme." M. Lanfrey's damnable account appears in fact to be unknown to Mr. Cochrane, who treats it as a "terrible fatality"

that the Duke's request for an audience of the First Consul was never delivered. The truth seems to be that orders were given beforehand that no attention should be paid to any such request, and equally distinct orders that the sentence should be executed on the spot. To the question, "Who dared to execute a Condé without the express command of the Chief of the State?" we may safely answer, "No one." The men who served Napoleon were not in the habit of playing tricks upon their keen-sighted and despotic master. We need not do him the injustice of believing him to have been, as he afterwards represented himself, the dupe of Talleyrand—a theory which our author is evidently half disposed to accept. The story, which Mr. Cochrane gives unhesitatingly, that at the council—if there really was any such council—held to discuss the proposal to arrest the Duke, Talleyrand read a report in favour of the measure, appears to be one of the many fables which have gathered round the true history. It was at the same council that Cambacérès is said to have ventured on the remonstrances which called forth the well-known taunt from his domineering colleague, "Vous êtes devenu bien avare du sang des Bourbons!"—words which, if spoken, are alone enough to show that the resolution to take the Duke's life was already fixed. It is possible that Napoleon may have wavered in his purpose during the few days between the 15th of March, when the Duke was seized, and the 20th, when he was brought to Vincennes; but after that there was not a moment wasted. The Duke entered Vincennes about six o'clock, when his grave was already dug; about midnight he was awakened from sleep to undergo a preliminary examination; at two o'clock he was brought before the military commission, presided over by Hullin; after a form of deliberation the sentence was passed, and the wearied victim was led out into the grey mist of early morning, placed by the side of his open grave, and shot then and there. Mr. Cochrane tells us that when the doomed man asked for a priest, he was answered by a scornful voice from among the few officers who stood at the edge of the fosse, "He wishes to die like a capuchin." Another ghastly detail is given, in modern phrase, with all reserves. It has been said that, as it was so dark or so foggy that the firing party could with difficulty see their mark, the adjutant, by Savary's order, fastened a lantern to the Duke's breast. If a man is to be shot, it is probable that he would not himself object to anything which would tend to ensure his death at the first discharge; but this sort of *impia pietas* has always the effect of sending a thrill of horror through the hearers; and at any rate Savary denied the story. The last touch of pathos is given by the Duke's dying charge that a lock of his hair and his ring should be delivered to the Princess Charlotte de Rohan-Rochfort. Even Horace Vernet, much as his pencil did towards propagating the Napoleonic cult, must have felt some pity when he illustrated at this point the *Vie de Napoléon* with a vignette of the broken lily, snapped by the shots which have bespattered the castle-wall behind it. We lament to add that Mr. Cochrane again thinks it necessary to introduce his favourite metaphor, "The Angel of Death seemed to unfold its wings over the city," just as he or it had done before for the Duke of Guise. We had almost as soon that the author had copied honest Launcelot Gobbo at once—"For the young gentleman (according to fates and destinies, and such odd sayings, the sisters three, and such branches of learning) is, indeed, deceased."

SPENCER'S PRINCIPLES OF SOCIOLOGY.*

(Second Notice.)

WE now come to that part of Mr. Spencer's work where he enters on that which may be most properly called the science of society, and considers the phenomena of social growth and structure in their most general aspects. For this purpose he makes no use of the natural history of primitive beliefs which takes up the first half of the volume, and of which we have already spoken; and we confess that we do not at present clearly understand the arrangement of the book. Arrangement for its own sake, however, is a thing we do not care very much for. In this case, at any rate, each part is an inquiry fairly complete in itself, and within itself exceedingly well arranged; and the continuation of the work may explain more.

The part entitled "The Inductions of Sociology" is occupied chiefly with the working out of the comparison of a society to an organism. The comparison is not in itself new. Plato and Hobbes have made use of it in their very different ways, and the metaphor of the "body politic" is familiar. Nevertheless Mr. Spencer may claim to have made the idea his own by his treatment of it. For, instead of being content to regard it as a play of fancy, he perceived that the comparison, however erratically worked out in the Platonic Republic, was prompted by the feeling of a real and deep-seated analogy, and that the body politic was no mere metaphor. Having perceived this, he brought scientific insight and imagination to bear on organic and social phenomena respectively as they appear to our present knowledge and in their most general forms; and the result is a detailed parallel whose extent and minuteness cannot fail to surprise the reader, however prepared he may already be to accept it in a general way. We are all the more bound to express our admiration for the

* *The Principles of Sociology*. By Herbert Spencer. Vol. I. *Descriptive Sociology*, &c. By Herbert Spencer and Professor David Duncan. Nos. 4 and 5. London: Williams and Norgate. 1875-6.

ingenuity and wealth of illustration displayed in this part of Mr. Spencer's work, inasmuch as we do not agree with some of the consequences which he seems inclined to derive from it, for the most part tacitly rather than formally. We do not see, indeed, how any parallelism in growth, structure, or function between an organism and a society can help us much in ascertaining what is good for the society at any stage of its existence. As Mr. Spencer himself points out, there is this immense contrast, that in the society we have to consider the welfare of the separate individuals of which it is made up; and this at once throws the comparison largely out of gear for practical purposes. So far as the parallelism does hold and is capable of giving real results, the same results can be got directly with the same or greater ease, and with more safety. If we seek for assurance that the concentration of all the departments of government in one hand is fitted only for rude states of society, we shall more readily find it in the political experience of mankind, or, in other words, in the history of political evolution, than in the analogous physiological process of the evolution of the nervous system from lower to higher types. And if we let the comparison guide us in less broad and obvious topics, there is not only less convenience, but positive inconvenience, as the danger of running after mistaken analogies becomes considerable. At the same time we are disposed to think that the study of these analogies may indirectly be of considerable use in forming a habit of thinking in a scientific manner about social facts and processes. The comparison has already led to one material addition to science, but in the converse direction; the idea of the division of labour, having already been made familiar by political economy on the social scale, led physiologists to the discovery of the corresponding facts in individual organisms. But it must not be overlooked that in this case the inference admitted of direct verification.

While we have, both in the natural body and in the body politic, a continuous life which outlives that of the component parts, we have the no less striking difference that the natural body is all in one piece and the body politic is not. Mr. Spencer most ingeniously attenuates the difference by observing that on the one hand many parts of an animal's body, a vertebrate animal's at least, can hardly be called alive, and that the social organism, though physically discrete, is for the purposes of social action made continuous by language. The next great difference is that whereas in the individual organism the parts are clearly subordinate to the benefit of the whole, "it is otherwise in the social organism." "The society exists for the benefit of its members, not its members for the benefit of the society." We have no objection to this statement so long as it is remembered that those for whose benefit the society exists are all its members, not some or any limited number, and that this includes future generations as well as the present. If this last point is overlooked there is danger of repeating in theoretical politics the legal fallacy of supposing that all the existing members of a corporation are free to dissolve the corporation, and divide its funds among themselves. Mr. Spencer proceeds to work out the details of the analogy in a manner of which we can give only a slight notion. It is not merely that society shows general correspondences with a living organism of some kind; there is a correspondence in growth as well as in structure, and the differences between rudimentary and civilized societies answer to the differences between lower and more highly developed forms of life. In the growth of the individual of a higher species the stages by which its organs must, in the past history of the species, have been evolved from lower types are, as it were, hurried and slurred over. The same thing happens in societies; when once a new type of industry, for example, is established, it is quickly reproduced wherever it may be wanted. The transition from the solitary worker in his own house to the associated labour of factories was the work of centuries; but, the "factory form of structure" being once established, new factories spring up rapidly wherever a new field is opened to manufacture. In the same way we see that a new State or colony reproduces full-blown the developed institutions of its metropolis. In the lower animals, again, it is comparatively easy for one part to assume the functions of another. Such is also the case, and for similar reasons, in societies where the division of labour is still unknown; while in the higher animals, as in more advanced societies, these substitutions are almost or altogether impossible. The growth of the "distributing system" which conveys nutriment from one part of the organism to another gives rise to a parallelism which may be pursued into the minutest details. Mr. Spencer even compares the up and down lines of railways to the venous and arterial circulation. Apart from railways, a certain approximation, though a rough one, to Mr. Spencer's "double channel" may be found in the rule of the road, which presents a very pretty sociological puzzle of the smaller kind. Why do carriages take the left hand in England, but the right everywhere on the Continent (we believe) except in Bohemia, where the English rule prevails? And how did the Continental rule come to be adopted in the United States, but not in Canada? Again, in the stage before roads and commerce are established there exists in fairs and markets a rudimentary circulation comparable to that of such low animal types as the ascidian. As development advances, competition exists in the natural as well as in the social body, for the organs compete with each other for their supply of blood. Mr. Spencer incidentally speaks of "morbid growths, which not only draw to themselves much blood, but develop in themselves vascular structures to distribute it"; and this suggests the organized

frauds of Company-floating syndicates and New York rings as a pretty close social parallel.

The growth of governing functions is also traced in the same sort of comparison. A curious point of detail (which, however, is hardly worked out) is that the older parts of the nervous system on the one hand, and of governing institutions on the other, tend to become comparatively automatic as parts of later origin assume greater importance. The vaso-motor system of nerves, which regulates nutrition and secretion, and in the higher animals is all but independent of the cerebro-spinal system which controls muscular movement, is likened by Mr. Spencer to the commercial arrangements of society, which in the most civilized States are least interfered with by the political rulers. The parallel, to which we cannot do justice here, is extremely ingenious. We do not think, however, that the usual arguments for Free-trade are likely to be superseded by expanding to the social scale, for instance, the reflection that, if a man tries to assist his digestion by thinking about it, he will probably only make himself ill. Still less are these analogies capable of supporting the proposition that legislative interference with commercial transactions is on all occasions an unmixed evil. The true principle, we conceive, is that interference in the supposed interest of the parties themselves is almost always a mistake; but this leaves the question of interfering with private interests for the common good to be dealt with in each case on its own merits. Mr. Spencer states, in a very broad way, that industrial activity goes along with free institutions; and he contrasts the despotic government and enforced regulation of the details of life which mark the "militant type" of society with the "industrial mode of regulation" by voluntary association for special purposes which prevails in the "industrial type." Among the characters of the industrial state of freedom he further mentions, apparently without disapproval, that "there arises a tendency in minorities to disobey even the Legislature deputed by the majority when it interferes in certain ways." We trust not. There are, and probably there always will be, factious little knots of people who glory in carrying on a sort of petty rebellion on behalf of their crotchets. But the bulk of the free, sober, rational citizens, not of these kingdoms only, but of all English-speaking kindreds and nations, choose rather to glory, and we hope ever will do so, in the name of law-abiding men; knowing how to maintain their opinions by all lawful means, and at all fit seasons; but not less knowing that, if law should cease to be supreme, a worse evil would be inflicted on the community than could be the effect of the worst possible laws; and understanding how to render to the commonwealth whereof they are members a service which is perfect freedom. Were this not so, the prospect before us would indeed be a grave one; we should have to look forward to the legal order of a free constitution coming into mere contempt, to a growth of lawlessness at length making government impossible, and finally to the return of society, in some act of desperate self-defence, to the despotic methods of government which it cost our fathers so much toil to cast off. But Mr. Spencer is alarmed already; he thinks we are in a state of retrogression towards the military type. The wars of the last twenty years have revived a military spirit, and the result is an access of government interference in all the affairs of life. Here we seem to trace influences which are foreign to the main body of Mr. Spencer's thought; and he becomes for once, what he very rarely is, both unfair and superficial. He seems to fix the beginning of the alleged period of reaction about 1852. Profound peace before this, wars great and small after; industrial freedom before, government encroachment after. But long before 1852 we were engaged in wars of great and even critical importance in our Eastern dominions, and in the very midst of the long peace there were rumours of war in Europe itself. It was also long before 1852 that Parliament committed itself to a course of interference in the matters where legislative interference with private action has been most conspicuous of late years. Public Health, Factories, Education—on all these the State had already begun to lay its hands; what has been done since is only development.

In other ways, too, the statement is one-sided. Mr. Spencer denounces various proceedings in Africa and elsewhere, which he calls "a revival of predatory activities"; but he omits to notice that we have distinctly abandoned the policy of annexation in India. He complains of public interference in the domain of private trade, and forgets that we swept away, as late as 1854, the lingering fragments of the usury laws, and that in much later years we have legalized Trade-Unions, and repealed the last vestiges of the series of coercive statutes which once attempted to regulate labour. But such is the animus of these few pages that we only wonder that Mr. Spencer has passed over the alarming symptoms of our policemen having been put into helmets and our postmen into shakos. Besides, the general connexion between despotism and interference is not sufficiently made out. We are expected to draw a sweeping inference as to causes from a single case of coincidence; examples from other times and countries should at least have been indicated. Asiatic military despotisms do not interfere with local or private affairs; as Sir H. Maine has pointed out, they are tax-taking, not legislating, empires; they collect the revenue, and leave the people to be ruled by their local customs, with which the government does not, and probably could not, interfere. In the United States a society which shows the nearest approach yet seen to the purely "industrial type" has shown also the monstrous backsliding, as it must appear to Mr. Spencer, of free common schools. In modern Switzerland, again, every man is a soldier, but we are not aware that this has led to any reversion to the despotic model;

and the "integration" of Germany, brought about by military action, is tending on the whole (notwithstanding the ecclesiastical laws) to strengthen the liberal elements in domestic institutions. For the rest, we are not disposed to assume that the "militant type" is altogether a bad thing. Many forms and structures persist and are useful for quite other purposes than those they originally served. The swift and certain command of brain over muscle, developed in ancestors by the combative needs of savage life, serves the civilized man for the nobler arts of peace, and the habits of discipline and united action engendered in societies by the early necessities of warfare have also their uses, and perhaps more than we yet know, in a condition relatively free from war. A specific instance offers itself at once in the drill of fire-brigades and life-boats. But, speaking more largely, we do not see why the State may not be the highest form of co-operation for many purposes besides those of war and police. Mr. Spencer constantly forgets that "the State" is not something outside the citizens. He speaks with acerbity against providing men with libraries and museums at the public cost; but what is the public cost? Why, their own cost. However, on these matters our difference with Mr. Spencer is too fundamental to be sufficiently treated here. We turn with more pleasure to the suggestion of a "possible future social type" which may improve on the industrial by carrying into practice the belief that work is for life, and not life for work. Mr. Spencer seems to look forward to a greatly increased importance of intellectual and æsthetic culture; may we say to a renewed Athens without the dark background of slave-labour and taxed allies? But the forecast is purposely cut short.

We have no room to speak of the concluding part of the volume, where Mr. Spencer treats of the early history of marriage. His remarks on Mr. McLennan's and Sir J. Lubbock's theories are in the main judicious, and duly appreciate the complexity of causes to be apprehended in all such inquiries, which Mr. Spencer himself has in our opinion underrated in former parts of the book. We can also say very little of the last two numbers of *Descriptive Sociology*. They deal with the barbarous or semi-civilized Asiatic and African races, and the general observations we have already made on the preceding numbers are applicable to them. It may be repeated that caution is needful in using a digest of this kind. Thus, in the account of Kalmuck morality we find statements of what is obviously imported Buddhist doctrine; but a reader who did not perceive this would be misled. We do not mean that it was the compiler's business to supply the warning. One thing we are bound specially to mention as a matter of personal justice. In a former notice we had to compare Professor Duncan's part of the work with Dr. Scheppegg's, and not to the advantage of the former. Mr. Spencer now explains that Professor Duncan left England while the work was pending, so that in the later stages it unavoidably escaped his own supervision. In fact, the blunders to which we called attention were chiefly, if not wholly, in such matters of workmanship as would naturally be affected by this cause; and we are glad to give to the explanation equal publicity with our former criticism.

THE MAKERS OF FLORENCE.*

EVERY experienced reader is familiar with the difference which exists between books that grow naturally in the author's mind, and books that are made by deliberate intention as a matter of literary business. The work before us is a specimen of modern book-making; not at all a bad specimen, but still recognizable at once by the usual marks of that particular professional product. To a remark of this kind the author may answer:—"Well, and what then? Suppose my book is a bit of book-making, *qu'est ce que cela prouve?*" He may even use the familiar *tu quoque* argument, and affirm that critics have no right to make such remarks in articles which are just as much specimens of downright professional literature as any books that issue from the press. We insist, however, upon the distinction between the books that grow and the books that are made artificially. The process with regard to the work before us would seem to have been this. Mrs. Oliphant knows Florence, has taken an interest in the history of the city, and especially in that of a few of its leading men. Then the idea has occurred to her that the material so accumulated was very good literary material, and might just as well be made use of as not. It might be utilized in a series of studies of leading Florentines, bound together in a volume and united under a common title. The title sounds well; but it is not accurate. The men whom Mrs. Oliphant has written about did not make Florence, but found the city existing already in the most vigorous life; they embellished, or governed, or agitated it, but it is a curious stretch of language to say that they made it.

The book is divided into three main parts, one treating of Dante, another of the Cathedral Builders, and the third of the Monks of San Marco. It concludes with a chapter on Michael Angelo. The most thorough piece of work in the whole volume is the study of Savonarola, which occupies five chapters; and the best illustration is a very carefully engraved portrait of him, which appropriately serves as a frontispiece. Besides this engraving, there are about fifty woodcuts which add considerably to the interest and value of the work. The literary workmanship

in the biographical studies and sketches is that of a practised hand; indeed we have often felt tempted to regret the degree of literary facility and skill which constantly seduces the author into elegant and appropriate phrase-making. It has been a misfortune, too, for Mrs. Oliphant that her materials presented so few elements of novelty that she has felt compelled, for the mere sake of completeness, to say over again an immense number of things that have been said before. It requires, indeed, a degree of courage of which we have scarcely any conception to sit down deliberately in these latter days and write a chapter on Michael Angelo which is to omit nothing of importance in his life and character. We can perfectly understand how any one who wishes to demolish Michael Angelo, wholly or partially, may write about him vigorously enough. There is M. Charles Garnier, for instance, the architect of the new Opera-house at Paris, who has lately attacked Michael Angelo as to his architectural pretensions, and therefore had something new to say; but Mrs. Oliphant always admires what public opinion has decided that it is right to admire, and patiently repeats the old estimates, and quotes the old stories. Her chief merit in the present volume is to make things plainer to the ordinary reader who previously had but a confused knowledge of the subject. She sets her heroes in a good, clear light, and makes the utmost use of every detail. Sometimes the art of using detail is employed rather too obviously. For example, towards the close of the chapter on Archbishop Antonino she has to tell the simple fact that he replaced the flowers in his garden by vegetables for the use of the poor. Any reader can see at a glance that this was a charitable thing to do, and does not need to be told so. Now see how much Mrs. Oliphant makes of it:—

There is but one incident in this noble and simple record in which the good Antonino was a little hard upon nature. The garden attached to the Archbishop's palace was a beautiful and dainty one, in which former prelates had taken great delight, refreshing their dignified leisure in its glades. But an Archbishop who takes his exercise in the streets, leading a panniered mule laden with charities, has less need perhaps of trim terraces on which to saunter. Archbishop Antonino had the flowers dug up, and planted roots and vegetables for his poor, in respect to whom he was fanatical. One grudges the innocent flowers; but the old man, I suppose, had a right to his whim like another, and bishops in that age were addicted sometimes to less virtuous fancies—ravaging the earth for spoil to enrich their families and to buy marble for their tombs. It was better on the whole to ravage a garden, however beautiful, in order to feed the starving poor.

This is the art of book-making as applied to a single detail, which was just worth mentioning as an illustration of character. There is too much of such expansion in the volume, aided by abundance of sentiment, as in the present instance. When Dante goes to Rome as a pilgrim—a pilgrimage of which in his case nothing is known—Mrs. Oliphant is skilful enough to spin out two whole pages of sentimental padding of which we will give a specimen:—

And the poet was no sceptical bystander looking on at the devout crowds, hot and eager and weary, but a pious Catholic of the middle ages, no doubt thankful enough for the indulgence which gave him a tremulous sense of forgiveness and amnesty for all his errors, and humbly earning the same by the fifteen days of devotion prescribed, making his weary way from San Pietro across the bridge to San Paolo on the other side of the river. Many thoughts were in his mind, no doubt, among his Aves and Paternosters as he made the daily pilgrimage.

After this we have a page of conjecture about what Dante's thoughts may have been. Such passages will not bear any critical analysis. Their sentimentalism is intrusive and misapplied, as sentimentalism often is when ready to gush forth *à propos* of anything or nothing. Why speak of the daily walk across the Tiber as the poet's "weary way"? It is such a short walk as many an old gentleman does every day for the benefit of his health without being weary at all, and Dante was young and strong. We do not need to be told that many thoughts must, no doubt, have been in Dante's mind. We certainly have no doubt about it. It is highly probable that, whenever Dante took a short walk, many thoughts were in his mind; so they are in most people's.

In fairness to Mrs. Oliphant, our next extract shall be from one of her better passages. She is speaking of Giotto:—

Even at so early a period he was himself and not merely Cimabue's pupil, Vasari, remarking in the after record upon a series of drawings which were said to be *invenzione di Dante*, suggests that even in the much-praised designs of Assisi the young painter had been aided by the poet. In most cases this is as foolish a suggestion as it is derogatory, for few people have either leisure or inclination thus to spend their strength for others, or even if it were not equally certain that most people prefer their own ideas to those of anybody else, and are as little disposed to be aided as the others are to aid. But the possible conjunction of Dante with Giotto is so full of interest that we cannot but hope there is some truth in it. Dante has himself described the sad abstraction in which, after the death of Beatrice, he sat "drawing an angel," too much engrossed to see the fine people who visited him; and if in the fervour of poetic talk, in the midst of some lengthened *ragionamento*, we could believe that the poet took up the painter's tool, and, fired by enthusiasm for all things beautiful, dashed upon the paper the rude outline of some quick-springing fancy or plan struck out by the conversation, a new interest would be thrown upon those great frescoes which are now being, so much as remains of them, laboriously and painfully preserved. Anything more than this could not be possible, and this of course is pure conjecture, though it opens to the imagination the possibility of a pleasant picture, a friendly conjunction agreeable to think of. Were they held, these *ragionamenti*, in the depths of Cimabue's bottega, while his pupil worked among all the unfinished canvases and great bare crucifixes waiting to be painted, the architectural plans, and chippings in marble, which denoted the young painter's universal study in all branches of his art? or was the country lad, perhaps in all the homeliness of his simplicity, invited to go in at leisure moments to that old house behind San Martino where the noble Magnifico lived, one of the first men of the city, and at the head, for the moment, of all public affairs? The scene is one upon which the imagination loves to dwell. The bare room, with little in it but the table on which stood the old classic

* *The Makers of Florence, Dante, Giotto, Savonarola; and their City.* By Mrs. Oliphant. With illustrations. London: Macmillan. 1876.

lamp, which still exists in Italy, throwing its light upon those two eager faces—the big *cassone* by the wall, rudely painted, in which Madonna Gemma brought home her plenishing when she married, and the heavy stools upon which the talkers sat. Petrarch, whose time was a little later, and who was never driven into exile, possessed a picture of Giotto's to leave behind him and bequeath by will with the solemnity which such a possession warranted; but Dante does not seem to have had any such wealth, though all the world no doubt seemed before him while he talked, advising his friend about Assisi and other matters, with no foresight of coming troubles in his mind.

This is the kind of writing which makes the staple of Mrs. Oliphant's book. It is the work evidently of a practised hand, but it tires the reader by making too much of a little material. What the public really needs is not elaborate conjecture about what historical personages may possibly have said or done at certain times, but a clear statement of what it is ascertained that they actually said or did. Mrs. Oliphant does not omit the ascertained facts; on the contrary, she has carefully collected them; but at the same time she mixes them up with such quantities of reflection and sentiment and conjecture that the reader is constantly under the temptation to skip, at the risk of missing something of real importance. The best part of the book is, as we have said, the long study of Savonarola, and the superior merit of this is due to the necessity for telling a succinct story. Before we come to Savonarola we have chapters on "A Peaceful Citizen," "The Angelical Painter," and "The Good Archbishop." The first is an account of Agnolo Pandolfini, a wealthy merchant of Florence who lived in the beginning of the fifteenth century; the second is about Fra Angelico, and the third about Archbishop Antonino. We knew already as much about Fra Angelico as Mrs. Oliphant has to tell us; but Agnolo Pandolfini and the Archbishop are less known. Mrs. Oliphant says truly of Agnolo:—

He is the very type and emblem of the good burgher, or rather perhaps the good *bourgeois*, a word which more forcibly conveys the meaning; a citizen citizenish in every aspect, somewhat pompous in his kindness and wisdom, with the most perfect satisfaction in all he has himself done, and appreciation of his own excellence. The old Italian shopkeeper, who had in his days played with credit the part of an ambassador, seated in his advanced age among his sons, who, gathered round him in his autobiographical narrative, receive all he says with plaudits, and echo the gratification and contentment with which he reviews his long and well-spent life, is as interesting a figure as can be found in the byways of history. That it has been a well-spent life Carlo and Gianozzo are proud to acknowledge—a model of everything that life ought to be in Florence. . . . How one ought to save and spare, how one ought to mind one's business, how one ought to choose one's house, and, above all, how one ought to govern and regulate one's wife, are the subjects treated in detail; though there is scarcely a word about the public life which must have filled so large a part in the citizen's career.

We scarcely agree with Mrs. Oliphant in her substitution of the French for the English word, *bourgeois* for burgher. Agnolo was much too splendid to realize the ideal implied by the word "bourgeois," notwithstanding all his economy. We have plenty of men in London who are not much unlike him; who are very rich, very generous, and yet really very careful at the same time, since they clearly understand and control their own affairs in everything, even in what appear to be their extravagances. The true French *bourgeois* is narrower in his feelings and ideas than the splendid Florentines were, though no doubt Agnolo had what Mrs. Oliphant calls "citizenish" notions, and was intensely satisfied with himself and with his own success. The "successful merchant" has not the vanity of poets and painters, but he has usually a great deal of quiet self-approval, which all surrounding influences tend to foster. Agnolo lived in what we should consider the condition of a great country squire or nobleman when in the country, and like a wealthy merchant in his house in Florence. All the great personages who came into the neighbourhood were lodged in Agnolo's villa at Signa, where there was a complete hawking and hunting establishment. His nature was so hospitable that he could not do without guests; and when his children came from Florence without bringing friends he reproved them. "When it happened that there were no visitors in the house after a great hawking, he sent to the road to see if any one passed that way, and gave orders to bring in all wayfarers to dinner." He must have kept a good many horses, for he never went out hawking with less than fifteen or twenty companions on horseback, besides those who went on foot with the dogs. Still the main subject of the treatise he wrote in his old age was economy; but he was careful to explain that he meant wise administration and not parsimony. He does not approve of keeping apples till they are rotten, and considers misers to be silly people who do not understand the management of wealth. Agnolo, had he lived in these days, would probably have been a great manufacturer; for he expresses a decided preference for those occupations which employ many hands and produce benefit to many; besides which he himself expresses a liking for overlooking the labours of others, and directing them, rather than doing any work himself. In fact, Agnolo was born to be a great industrial chief. On the other hand, he had a most passionate love for the country, a love which remained with him till the end of his long life. The following words of his read very like a quotation from Emerson, so modern, as it seems to us, is the sentiment, and rather English or American than Italian. The reader may find some amusement in taking Mr. Browning's "Up at a Villa—Down in the City," as distinguished by an Italian Person of Quality for a contrast:—

The country is gracious, trustworthy, true; if you give yourself up to it patiently and lovingly, it never seems to be satisfied with what it does for you, but continually adds reward after reward. In spring the villa gives thee continual delight; foliage, flowers, odours, songs of birds, and in every way makes thee gay and joyful—all smiles upon thee and promises a good

ingathering; fills thee with every good hope, delight, and pleasure. How courteous is the country! She sends you now one fruit, now another, never leaving the house empty of some of her gifts. In the autumn she pays thee back for all thy trouble—first out of all measure to thy labours, reward and thanks. And how willingly and with what abundance! Twelve for one; for a little sweat many bottles of wine; and that which gets stale by keeping the country gives in its season fresh and good. She fills the house all the winter through with grapes fresh and dry, with plums, nuts, figs, pears, apples, almonds, pomegranates, and other fruits wholesome and fragrant and delightful, and from day to day the later fruits. Even in winter she does not forget to be liberal; she sends you wood, oil, branches of laurel and juniper, drawn from the snow to make a fragrant and cheerful flame; and if you continue to live there, the villa will comfort you with splendid sunshine, and will give you the hare, the wild goat, the boar, the partridge, the pheasant, and many other kinds of birds, and the wide country in which you can follow them at your leisure; she will give you fowls, milk, kids, junket, and other delicacies which you can preserve the whole year through, so that through all the year your house may want for nothing; and will take pains that in your heart there should be no sorrow or trouble, but that you should be full of pleasure and usefulness. At the villa we enjoy days airy and clear and open; we have the glad some and joyful sight of fruitful slopes, of sweet plains, of those fountains and streams that leaping forth hide themselves under tufts of herbage. How blessed it is to live in the country, an unappreciated happiness!

The most striking thing in this passage is the strong power of enjoyment which it displays. The old man delights in life still like a vigorous boy; but one cannot help observing that he was singularly lucky in the particular sort of country that he lived in. There are many rustic situations much less agreeable than those in the picturesque neighbourhood of Florence, just as there are many towns less agreeable than Florence itself.

We are sorry that the limits of our space do not allow us to speak in detail of Mrs. Oliphant's careful and thorough study of Savonarola. So far as we have been able to judge of Savonarola's character from other sources, we agree with Mrs. Oliphant in her estimate of it. He is a singularly interesting personage, because he is an anachronism, just as, in quite a different way, Don Carlos is in these days—a being of another age, full of energy and power, attaining at a certain period of his career great influence by reason of his energetic nature, but failing at last, as all anachronisms do fail, because not really in harmony with his time, although he may have temporarily seemed to be so. Savonarola was not at all what we understand by a "reformer," for he came with no intellectual criticism of received doctrines, in which he seems to have believed quite implicitly. He had simply the nature of an Oriental prophet, believing himself to have a divine mission and inspiration, and making others believe it also. His whole history strikingly reminds us of certain prophets in the Old Testament; and when such a man finds himself in a situation which develops all his energies, including tremendous courage and will, they are sure to go on to a higher and higher degree of exaltation, till they lead him into situations from which there is no escape but death. The career of Savonarola, and its close, are a series of sequences so natural and apparently inevitable that it is impossible to imagine how matters could have turned out otherwise, when we know his character and his times.

THE SCOTTS OF SCOT'S HALL.*

FEW tourists on their way to the Continent think of pausing between London and the coast. But it would be hard to find anywhere out of England, or anywhere else in England, so fair a country as that through which their road lies. To most of them Sevenoaks, Tunbridge, Ashford, or Chislehurst, Otford, Smeeth, are but names, like the numbers on milestones. Yet it is not too much to say that people pay more and go further in order to visit scenes and places in France or Germany which are not only less beautiful, but less interesting, to the average Englishman than some of the little towns we have named. Smeeth, for example, stands near the summit of a long slope on the road from Ashford to Folkestone. A few miles further and the cliffs descend suddenly to the "marsh" in which archaeologists and artists have been so busy of late. But Smeeth itself is high and healthy, and to eyes content with undulating fields, green woods, and quaint farmhouses, most pleasing, almost beautiful. Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen has made it the scene of some of his stories for children, and he could not have chosen better. A little more than the ordinary Kentish pride may be pardoned to the natives, for the lines are indeed fallen to them in pleasant places, and they have a goodly heritage. The old church, which, so far, has suffered but little at the hands of restorers, and is in fair keeping and repair, contains a fine Norman chancel arch and other signs of its great antiquity. The monuments on the walls and the gravestones in the nave belong to a family which has long left the parish, but which still exists and looks with solicitude towards the old home. And not far off, on a southern slope whose irregularities attest the presence of ancient foundations, once stood the proud residence of the Scotts of Scot's Hall, a house famous in its day, but now only remaining in the traditions which the country folk preserve as to the vacant site. The Scotts were not buried in the church, but at Brabourne, not very far off. Their seat at Smeeth, though nothing now is left of it, was long the glory of the family; and, to judge by the descriptions and plans preserved of it, it must have been a splendid example of the homes of the upper middle class of which Kent has always boasted. To be a squire in Kent was an ambition worthy of any English gentle-

* *Memorials of the Family of Scott.* By James Renatt Scott. London: 1876.

man; even a "yeoman of Kent" was placed in the old proverb above

A knight of Cales, a gentleman of Wales,
And a lord of the north countrie.

Following the good example already set in many places, Mr. James Renatt Scott has, in the sumptuous volume before us, endeavoured to pick up the threads of a somewhat complicated pedigree, and to write the history of the great and wide-spreading family to which he belongs. He points out in his preface that "this ancient but unennobled family has furnished within historic times to its country's need, and in every service of the State, men of high standing and repute." He goes on to give a list which includes Sir William Scott, who was Chief Justice under Edward II. and Edward III.; another Sir William, who was Sword-Bearer to Henry V.; Sir John, who was Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports, and held other high offices under Edward IV.; a second Lord Warden, an Archbishop of York, a Judge of the Exchequer, two Ambassadors, "as well as others of less distinguished note, who witnessed the decay of their family and fortune in more modern and less troublous times, thus apparently paying the penalty suggested in the ancient Kentish proverb that

Scott's Hall shall have a fall;
Ostenhanger was built in angre (pride);
Somerfield will have to yield;
And Mersham Hatch shall win the match."

The present owners of the manor of Halle, or Scott's Hall, are owners also of Mersham Hatch, and the Scotts have given place to the Knatchbolls, whose head was till lately one of the Knights of the Shire for Kent. Thus the prophecy has been fulfilled; and, of the numerous descendants of the old stock, not one remains in the ancestral place. The Poynings of Ostenhanger are extinct, as are the Heymans of Somerfield, and the jingling rhymes which Mr. Scott attributes to Elizabeth Barton, the crazy prophetess, whose fall dragged down so many great folk, have come literally true. She was servant to Thomas Cobb, whose house, Cobb's Place, was in Aldington, the adjoining parish, and whose niece married Reginald Scott, the author of a famous book, the *Discovery of Witchcraft*, which roused the wrath of the wise King James by reason of its merciful tenets on the subject. In or about 1490 the heir of the Scotts married the heiress of the Pymmes of Nettlestead, and thenceforth lived at Scott's Hall only on occasions, and let it fall gradually into decay. At the present day the only tangible relic remaining of it is the pulpit of Smeeth church, a fine piece of oak carving which was formerly in the domestic chapel. The Hall was still standing, in part at least, until Francis Talbot Scott, the last in the direct line of the family, obtained an Act enabling him to sell it; and the ruins were not finally removed until the beginning of the present century. In 1799 Hasted described it as an imposing structure; and it is gathered from family correspondence still extant that the last of the old family fell into a settled melancholy on the compulsory sale of an estate which had been so many centuries in his family, as well as of the manor of Brabourne, in the church of which place sixteen generations had been buried. He died at the age of forty-four, and was buried with his fathers, leaving a son, who took holy orders, and had the honour at his baptism of having George, Prince of Wales, afterwards George IV., for his godfather. He died in 1839, and the present representative of the family, his first cousin, has several children and grandchildren living.

The woodcuts with which the book is adorned, the numerous coats of arms, the fac-similes of documents and other embellishments, make this one of the most sumptuous works of the kind which have been produced for many years. Mr. Scott has laboured hard at the genealogical, as well as at the topographical, particulars. He gives us much information as to manners and customs, and the series of family portraits forms quite a gallery of costume. We have little fault to find with any of the externals, and, if we venture to doubt the pedigree, it is only, as we hope to show presently, in its early portion. Mr. Scott has been at great pains to give us monuments and epitaphs in full, besides wills and inventories. There is a portrait of Margaret, wife of Edward Scott, who nursed George IV., and one of the celebrated Mrs. Mary Honeywood, who died in 1620, at the age of ninety-three, "and saw, of her own issue, sixteen children, 114 grandchildren, 228 great-grandchildren, and nine great-great-grandchildren, a total of 367 descendants." There are genealogical tables of every family into which the Scotts married, and they appear to be remarkably correct. But as to the evidence which connects this family with the Baliols, it is such as may perhaps satisfy heralds and genealogists, but nobody else. The first of them on record, Sir William, is stated to have been younger brother of John Baliol, King of Scots; but the assertion, though it may be true, wholly wants proof. It is true that Alexander Baliol had Chilham Castle, which is not far off; it is also true that he was sometimes called "le Scot," while the manor of Brabourne belonged to him and his descendants, who under the name of Strabolgi were summoned to Parliament, and bore the Scottish title of Earls of Athol. Mr. Scott greatly confuses the real question of the origin of the Scott family by disquisitions on the Strabolgis and other owners of the manor of Brabourne. This part of his book really does nothing for the elucidation of a very obscure pedigree. The Scotts were early seated in the parish, and the most easily supported theory would be that they were retainers in the service of the lords of the manor, possibly that they were illegitimately descended from some Baliol or Strabolgi. The manor itself did not become

theirs until the latter half of the fifteenth century, when Sir William Scott of Scot's Hall married Sybilla Lewknor, whose mother had inherited it from the Halshams, descendants of the Strabolgis. The pedigree of the Scotts from the Baliols has a very questionable look, and it is impossible to repress a feeling that it was never thought of till after this marriage. The very existence of the first-named William "le Scot" is doubtful; even that of Alexander Baliol of Chilham can only be allowed on the understanding that two of the brothers bore the same Christian name, which is improbable, though, of course, not impossible. The second figure in the pedigree, John le Scot, has an equally unsubstantial look. In fact, the first of the family of whose existence Mr. Scott gives us distinct proofs was the Chief Justice, Sir William, of whose parentage, it is as well to allow, nothing whatever is known. If he resided at Brabourne, it was not as a lord of the manor, but as a tenant; and a counter claim to him has been set up on behalf of a totally distinct family, that of Scott of Chigwell. Mr. Scott's attempt to connect them, as he does in a note, is unsupported by historical evidence, depending as it does entirely on his assumption of the Baliol pedigree. And if the parentage and descendants of Sir William are thus questionable, we may pass by a Michael who is called his successor, and also another William who, according to Hasted, was buried at Brabourne, and come down to John Scott of Brabourne, who is no myth at all, but who, in the seventh year of Richard II., was M.P. for Hythe, and in 1399 Lieutenant of Dover Castle. He married a lady who bore the not very aristocratic name of Cumbe, but who had the much more substantial attractions presented by an estate—Mr. Scott calls it a manor—in the parish. From this point the pedigree is tolerably certain, though Mr. Scott is a little too fond of putting two and two together to make half-a-dozen, and assumes more than would be safe if a point of law depended on his evidence. Having married one heiress, and found it pay, the Scotts continued the practice; and in the fifteenth century, as in the nineteenth, pedigrees have always been forthcoming for people who deserve well of their country by increasing their own estates. Unfortunately this kind of pedigree-making is still common. Mr. Scott, as a member of the family himself, cannot be expected, perhaps, to put aside all evidence except that which would satisfy a law court; but it is disappointing to see how many are the books in which similar carelessness—for it is nothing less—may be found. There is no reason why genealogy should not be a help rather than a hindrance to history. We have hoped against hope that the good example set by Mr. Shirley and by the late Mr. Nichols would be followed by a new generation of heralds. There are careful and painstaking family antiquaries in existence; but they would probably find their labours were not always welcome to the present owners of the names whose true origin they might endeavour to trace. It is rather in spite of the heralds that the history of English families must be made out. Mr. Scott's book is better than hundreds of others, because he freely exposes the evidence, or the want of evidence, on which he founds the antiquity of his family. So far we may thank him, as well as for giving us a pleasant and pretty book; but we hope to see equally pretty and pleasant books produced from which tradition and conjecture shall be altogether banished.

BRONZES IN SOUTH KENSINGTON MUSEUM.*

THE literature of art in this country is strangely deficient in treatises on sculpture. Painting and architecture have shared a better fate, partly because they can be more easily dealt with by the pen, and partly also because, in architecture especially, the present generation has witnessed startling movements and mutations which have provoked controversy and driven men back to the reconsideration of first principles. Unfortunately the art of sculpture, fixed, as it were, in a fatal finality, has for the most part held itself aloof from passing changes; it has existed side by side with revived Gothic styles, it has subsisted in the midst of the resuscitated spirit of mediævalism, and yet, with few exceptions, it gives little or no sign of renovated life. And as is the art, so has been its literature. The late Richard Westmacott, in his lectures to the students of the Royal Academy, had nothing new to teach, and Mr. Henry Weeks does not seem quite the man to awaken life in a dormant art, if he may be fairly judged by "the prize treatise" which he published "on the Fine Arts Section of the Great Exhibition of 1851." One of the best pieces of criticism we can recall came before the world in the modest guise of *A Handbook to the Courts of Modern Sculpture in the Crystal Palace*. Mrs. Jameson, though here deviating from her accustomed path, seizes with true intuition on the underlying principles which pervade the plastic arts in all time. Another praiseworthy effort deserving of remembrance is *Dædalus; or, the Causes and Principles of the Excellence of Greek Sculpture*, by Mr. Edward Falkener. The writer, in common with Gibson the sculptor, held that all "excellence is to be obtained by a careful study of Greek art"; strong is the expression of contempt for modern works, and scathing is the ridicule cast upon the author of *The Seven Lamps*. From what has been said it will be inferred that there was ample room for Mr. Fortnum's valuable contribution.

* *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Bronzes of European Origin in the South Kensington Museum*. With an Introductory Notice by C. Drury E. Fortnum, F.S.A., Science and Art Department of the Committee of Council on Education. London: Chapman & Hall. 1876.

The Introduction, of 210 pages, to this "Descriptive Catalogue" of bronzes, though avowedly far from exhaustive, is full of knowledge gathered from authentic sources; it is the issue of wide experience, and possesses exceptional weight from its well-balanced judgments. Though the volume comes before the public as a mere introduction to a catalogue, it deserves to be taken as a text-book.

The collection of bronzes at South Kensington is numerous and varied, but of course it cannot compare in importance with the treasures in the Neapolitan and other museums. Still credit is due to the purveyors of our West-end olla podrida for having, at a period not particularly propitious, lost few opportunities of forming an attractive collection. From time to time purchases have been made from the Soulagues, the Bernal, the Pourtales, the Webb, and the Gherardini collections, from the museum of the Collegio Romano, and the International Exhibitions of Paris and London. The prices paid range from 1s. 3d. upwards; as much as 650*l.* was given for a "mirror of mixed metal, in a bronze case, inlaid with gold and silver," by Donatello; date about 1450. The student within the Museum will be tempted to pass from bronzes to marbles and terra cottas, in order the better to understand artists and schools which seldom find full expression in one material only. The mediæval, or rather the renaissance, school of Tuscany is especially well represented in reliefs and figures by Della Quercia, Donatello, Rossellino, Civitate, Luca and Andrea della Robbia, and Michael Angelo. The works of these and other masters afforded Mr. J. C. Robinson material for his work on *Italian Sculpture of the Middle Ages and Period of the Revival*. The photographs taken from these examples within the Museum by Mr. Thurston Thompson, so long ago as 1862, remain to this day as sharp and clear as when first executed. The well-selected illustrations to the present volume labour under the disadvantage of blackness; but, being printed by the "Woodbury Process," their permanence is presumed to be assured. The Catalogue has been further illustrated by nine etchings, "the work of Students, in training as Art Teachers, in the Etching Class at the South Kensington Art Schools, under the direction of the late Richard J. Lane, A.R.A." These etchings, as might be expected, fall beneath the high standard of the best work in Paris; and yet it may be remembered that the collected products of the Kensington Class obtained warm encomiums in the Viennese International Exhibition. The loss of Mr. Lane, the director of the class, has been deeply felt; in the etching studio much was due to his fidelity and taste, as we can testify from personal observation.

Among the bronzes Mr. Fortnum names, as specially noteworthy, a statuette of St. Jerome of the *quattro cento* period, the Infant Saviour, and a Cupid blowing a horn, severally attributed to Verrocchio. Of bas-reliefs, the range is more extended; the great excellence and the characteristic qualities of the smaller bas-reliefs known as plaques, works of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, give occasion for the following eulogy:—

During that period bronze was so favourite a vehicle for art, that the great sculptors and goldsmiths of the day devoted their talents to the production of even small objects of utility and ornament in the classic metal. Lamps, candlesticks, inkstands, small statuettes, medals, were not only designed, but fashioned and finished by themselves. Those small bas-relief plaques (of which there are many in this collection) display composition and execution that deserve particular attention. They form, indeed, an epitome of the sculpture of their age, parallel to the ivories of the preceding centuries. It is probable that many were originally worked in the precious metals, casts being also taken at the time in bronze. They were designed for many purposes, as plaques and tablets for religious use, as the reverse of medals, pommels of swords, the backs of large watches, panels for caskets, cabinets, &c.; some also were cast from seals and engraved crystals.

What we have said will have sufficiently indicated that this Catalogue makes no mention of any signal works from Greece or Rome; hence Mr. Fortnum finds little occasion to consult either Winckelmann or Müller on ancient art. Many of the museums of Europe are rich in spoils from ancient tombs or buried cities. Herculean and Pompeii have been mines of wealth to Neapolitan antiquaries; hence the number and rare excellence of the bronzes within the Royal Museum. In like manner, among the collections of Central Italy are dispersed the art treasures found in the sepulchres of ancient Etruria; we may mention, as striking examples in the Etruscan Museum at Florence, the bronze of "the fabulous beast called the Chimæra," found at Arezzo in 1559; also "una Secchia (Situla) Etrusca di Bronzo trovata presso Bolsena nell'autunno del 1871." And, coming nearer home, our British Museum takes a foremost position in classic art by reason of the marbles brought from the Parthenon, from Lycia, and from the Mausoleum at Halicarnassus. The South Kensington Collection has avowedly been cut off from such resources, under the tacit understanding that classic art shall be concentrated in Great Russell Street. At one time the competition between rival Museums became so sharp that one heard rumours of hostile biddings being made in the auction-room for the possession of identical works. Those times of internecine warfare have now happily ceased, and terms of peace have been arranged. Sir Charles Eastlake gave evidence against the concentration of all the art of the country on any one spot; and when the example of the Louvre was urged in favour of such a project, the obvious reply followed that it could scarcely happen to anybody to visit in a single day all the conglomerated collections which passed under that name. The much-debated question has now been solved, and if the South Kensington Museum surrenders the ambition of becoming a second Louvre, it bids fair to stand, especially within the sphere of decorative art, the rival of the

Hôtel de Cluny. But the lines of division, after true English fashion, are wanting in rigid demarcation; thus ivories are divided between Brompton and Bloomsbury, and Mr. Maskell, who disposed of the "Maskell Collection" to the British Museum, writes the admirable Catalogue reviewed in these columns on the Ivories at Kensington. There can scarcely be a doubt that a union of these divided treasures, if it were practicable, would be highly desirable. The same argument does not apply with equal force to bronzes.

Mr. Fortnum need not have apologized for any incompleteness in his essay. Though perhaps not quite a "finished picture," yet in detail it shows the painstaking of a miniature, while in its breadth it has the scope of a universal history. The first chapter, "On the Composition of Bronze," is all but exhaustive of a subject which associates science with art. Copper is the parent metal, and its alloy—tin—is used in slightly varying proportions, with the occasional additions "of silver, zinc, lead, and other simple metals." In Munich, where special attention has been given to the chemistry of the arts, the admixture, as used in the colossal figure of Schwanthaler's "Bavaria," yields a more than commonly light and warm tint. The material of bronze might seem to be something more than an accidental or artificial compound. We may almost look upon it as a product prearranged by nature. Ninety parts of copper, when united with ten parts of tin, make a total bulk "considerably less than that occupied by the two metals previous to their combination, the result being a great increase in hardness, perhaps due to the interpenetration of their atoms. Their aggregate fusibility is, moreover, much increased." Mr. Fortnum traces the origin of bronze to the East; on this point, however, Swedish antiquaries are prepared to take up arms. M. Hans Hildebrand, in a paper on the Royal Archaeological Museum at Stockholm, published in *Le Compte Rendu du Congrès International d'Anthropologie et d'Archéologie Préhistoriques*, writes as follows:—

Dès ses commencements mêmes, l'âge du bronze scandinave se sépare de l'âge du bronze d'autres pays, tels que la Hongrie, l'Allemagne moyenne et méridionale, la Suisse, l'Italie, la France et l'Angleterre. Les formes scandinaves l'emportent par une plus grande élégance de forme et d'ornements (spires, etc.). Il est même impossible de montrer dans une autre contrée, tant de l'Europe qu'en dehors de l'Europe, un âge de bronze avec lequel l'âge du bronze scandinave présente des rapports de filiation. L'on ne peut toutefois considérer la civilisation scandinave du bronze comme autochtone, mais il est impossible, d'autre part, d'indiquer avec sûreté la voie qu'elle a suivie pour parvenir jusqu'à nous.

The Introduction brings the history of sculpture in the nations of Europe down to the present time, and the criticisms on the contemporary art of the Continent evince a knowledge seldom possessed by Englishmen. The tone assumed is that of a mind habituated to hold converse with the masterpieces of past ages, and accordingly the modern works of Canova, Thorwaldsen, Rauch, Schwanthaler, Pradier, Triqueti, Marochetti, and others are approached in the attitude of polite condescension. And yet we cannot much object to the criticism which pronounces Rauch, who modelled the equestrian statue of Frederick the Great in Berlin, "wanting in high ideal aspiration in subjects beyond the range of monumental portraiture"; nor can it be controverted that, while many of the works of Pradier have "an extraordinary charm, they do not appeal to the higher mental or religious sentiments"; neither can the fact be denied that "striking and energetic work" the equestrian bronze statue of Richard Cœur de Lion in Old Palace Yard, Westminster, is not "faultless in its action or proportions."

We regret that we are not able to throw much sunshine into the deeply-shadowed picture which is drawn of our public monuments. Exceptional praise is properly bestowed on the equestrian statue of Charles I. at Charing Cross, and on "the group in bronze at Somerset House, by John Bacon, R.A. (1740-1799), perhaps the most talented and purely English sculptor of his time." We think more credit is due to John Flaxman than is here paid. The "St. Michael" of this sculptor has been rightly deemed a *chef-d'œuvre* in modern art; and we remember, when Covent Garden Theatre was burned, hearing John Gibson, in the Café Greco at Rome, express great anxiety for the fate of the Flaxman reliefs on the façade of that house. That Flaxman's poetic conceptions so seldom passed from the region of thought into the material form of marble or bronze remains a lasting loss to the English school. Of the low estate of our native school Mr. Fortnum speaks out with unflinching boldness. Though allowing some merit to the notorious "pig-tail statue" of George III. in Cockspur Street, by Matthew Coates Wyatt (1777-1862), he can find no words of palliation for the ungainly effigy by the same artist of the Duke of Wellington mounted on a charger on the top of the arch at Hyde Park Corner. It may be interesting to know that this colossal figure, "more important for its size than for artistic excellence, is formed in about eight pieces, screwed and fused together, and weighs some forty tons." Passing along Waterloo Place, disfigured by the "Guards' Memorial," and turning into Pall Mall, where kindly recognition is given to Foley's bronze statue of Lord Herbert, the author reaches Trafalgar Square, "that unfortunate site doomed by the Fates to modern artistic catastrophe." "Central here, in discordant harmony with its surroundings, rises the Nelson column"; "at the four angles are crouching lions, modelled by Sir Edwin Landseer, and cast in a mixed metal, said to be bronze," but wanting in the characteristic excellences of that alloy. We are glad to add that the over-rated Sir Francis Chantrey shares in the sweeping censure; the equestrian statue of George IV. on the same "unfortunate site" as the effigies of Havelock by Behnes and of Napier by Adams is briefly dismissed as "ill conceived." The author, in

the mournful contemplation of these national failures, specially conspicuous in "the two huge monuments to Wellington and Nelson," asks the question, "Why did the spirit of creative sculpture stand coldly by, nor lend her aid for such exalted themes?" After pausing for a reply, the answer comes, "She could not have been there!"

ALDYTH.*

MISS FOTHERGILL has chosen a hackneyed theme for her new book. The noble, self-sacrificing woman whose first youth has passed, and whom in consequence her lover, long parted and until now constant, deserts in favour of her younger, fairer, fresher sister, is a story that has been done to death. And in most cases the rendering of character and motive is but a disjointed, non-sequential kind of thing, which spoils our pleasure, such as it might have been, in a plot that is necessarily irritating because of the blind fatuity and silly sensuality of the hero. We think that *Aldyth* shows the want of life-likeness and common sense usually attaching to this special story. Given ten years' separation, where a man has been in the habit of seeing pretty and gently-nurtured women, and given a man to whom physical beauty in a woman is the first consideration—an artist, a man of confessed voluptuous habits, or one who aspires to hold a high social position, and who therefore wants a "show wife" to be at the head of his table and the mistress of the *salon*—and it is intelligible that the bloom of four-and-twenty should be more attractive than the comparatively faded loveliness of thirty-one. But the character and circumstances of Jack Ferriers would seem to be of a kind to make constancy of some weight in the matter, and a man's honour of more value than a girl's beauty. The idea of personality, too, cherished for all these years, has its own sanctity; and a man does not change the object, the name, the person to whom he has been devoted for the best part of his manhood at the first sight of her pretty young sister. Thirty-one is not such a formidable age for a woman; and to Jack, who had been knocking about in Australia, deprived of all refining influences, and with no drawing-room ambition, a woman like Aldyth would have been infinitely charming and delightful. Had she been forty-five or fifty we can imagine the shock of difference between what she was at twenty-one and what she would be after so many years of absence; but at Aldyth's age a woman must have been specially unlucky to have so completely lost her charm as to be outside the possibility of love and admiration.

Again, from the second title of her book it would seem as if the author intended to write mainly on the character of Jack Ferriers, to portray the weakness which spoils his virtues, and makes his manliness more a thing of thews and sinews than of mind and morals, running like a determining thread through the whole pattern of his nature; whereas, in point of fact, he is out of the story altogether, save in the beginning, when he leaves for Australia, bound to Aldyth, and in the end, when he comes home to marry her, and elopes with her youngest sister Caroline instead. All through the body of the book we see nothing whatever of him; so that beyond the elemental fact of his weakness of will, the character which gives the second title to the novel is of no dramatic importance in the story. But, in spite of the moral weakness so much insisted on, we do not believe that he would have run off with Caroline; nor, in spite of the hard decision and strong egotism of the girl, do we think that she would have tempted him to such dishonour. In the majority of women's novels, however, personal passion seems to be the only form of love that is recognized, and the doctrine of the restraining influence of manly honour is as old-fashioned as Sir Charles Grandison's bows or Clarissa Harlowe's adventures.

The character of Aldyth is very tenderly touched; and her good deeds are worthy of a better fate. She and her brother Harold are left as guardians to their younger brothers and sisters; but it is the woman who is the protecting genius of the family, and the man who is selfish and unworthy. Indeed almost all the men are selfish and unworthy, each in his own way; whether it is Harold, with his commonplace egotism in choosing for his wife a foolish little woman whom he loves, and his sisters do not; Edmund, whose temper is as cynical as his heart is cold and his aims purely personal; Jack Ferriers, who is the traditional weak-minded giant, unable to resist a fancy, a woman, or his own passions; Lifton Darwin, who is an elegant flirt, in his turn unable to make up his mind to take the girl whom he really loves, and whom he almost loses, and as vacillating as he is handsome on the one hand and silly on the other; while the honest lad of the book is a schoolboy cub, and the unselfish and noble-minded one a girlish cripple. This kind of thing is the revenge which woman takes on her master—man painted by his victim, and shown to be the poor creature which it is the present fashion to make him. The girls are certainly better, though here too the author has mixed not a little vinegar with her ink.

Of Aldyth we have already spoken. Conscientious and self-sacrificing, she is as the second mother of the family, keeping the governess in order and her brother Harold in check, managing the house and looking after the girls whom she has accepted as a legacy from the dead mother, and whom she endeavours to bring up as that mother would have done. For this reason she refuses to go to Australia with her lover when he and her younger brother

Edmund set out to find fortune in the Bush. She loves him and he loves her, passionately, devotedly; but she feels it to be her duty to stay at home, and accordingly she lets him go without her, and bears her cross with dignity and patience. Soon after this Harold marries a certain Miss Lucy Lestock, a silly, simpering young person who had been the governess at Follyfoot where the Sweynson family live, and who had been dismissed for incompetence by Aldyth. She taught false Latin, and took the girls into Cicero before they could conjugate the verb "to be." With all Aldyth's virtues we cannot praise her manner of acting towards her brother's wife, while the conduct of the younger sisters, Esther and Caroline, was neither humane nor well-bred. The author lays great stress on Aldyth's natural feelings of religious horror and repugnance at the idea of Lucy Lestock living in her mother's rooms and inheriting or using her mother's possessions. But this is simply silly. As a woman of sense, she must have known that Harold's wife, whoever she might be, must needs be mistress and possessor; and the transfer of the maternal *lures* and *penates* made to a brother's wife is not the same thing, even to the most loving daughter, as if that brother had been the father, and the sister-in-law the step-mother. Aldyth and her sisters give way to a great deal of childish ill-temper on the occasion of this marriage, and the younger sisters behave abominably; so badly indeed do they all conduct themselves, that not all the author's sympathy with them, and dislike of Lucy, can excuse the former or divert one's feeling of natural pity for the latter. The unseemly altercations which take place between the two belligerent parties, represented by Harold and his wife on the one hand and Aldyth and her sisters on the other, come to an end by these last leaving Follyfoot for the Dower House, where they have at least peace, and what the Americans would call a good time on the whole. They are great friends with the brothers Darwin—Lifton, the handsome, well-endowed, and fascinating flirt, and Philip, the deformed and morbid but clever boy, who tells the story. Lifton and Esther have what is at first a small flirtation that gradually grows into an intense love on her part, to be matched later by one as intense on his. But, for no reason that any one can understand, Lifton runs the chance of losing his happiness and Esther by not speaking at the right moment, when he has the opportunity before she leaves for the Continent. Of course no one in a novel could do such a bit of commonplace wisdom as write a note that should explain everything as well as spoken words; and as there was no reason why Lifton should not have written, we are at a loss to understand his blurred and smeared pencil note:—"Two years to wait, most likely, and all because I missed one day! will she distrust me?—I wish I had —."

When, however, Esther does come home after her two years of absence, she nearly distracts, and does considerably surprise, Lifton by her coolness; and Philip tries to bring about a better understanding, but to no purpose. Esther has seen an old flame of Lifton's, with whom he had flirted *more suo* in times past, and who had made mischief with Esther, so that when Lifton makes his offer, without due preparation, he finds that the old proverb is correct, and that he who will not when he may shall have nay when he will. He proposes, and Esther refuses him; and this is the way in which he bears his misfortune:—

Thus I had sat for half an hour or more, growing every minute more fascinated, and drawn to the mysterious world out of doors, when suddenly the spell was broken. I saw some one coming towards me—a man.

I felt no fear of him. A human presence, after the breathless state of awe and suspense in which I had been sitting, was a relief, let the being be what he might. This man walked up the lawn slowly. It seemed to me that his head was hanging, and he trailed one foot after the other, as if too weary to care how he walked. No wonder I failed to know him for my brother Lifton, till he confronted me, and then the pale face, hollow eyes, and half scornful, half despairing expression were so different from his, that I stared at him in wonder and fright. I felt more than that; a thrill of sick uneasiness shook me, such as I had never felt before, for I had never seen Lifton look so before, and had yet to learn what terrors we may undergo in watching the sufferings of those we love.

"Lifton!" I cried, rising and looking at him, "what is it? Why are you coming in in this way? What has happened?"

I seized his hand, and tried to pull him in. He looked at me, but for the first time in my life he looked at me without a smile. Nevertheless, he came in, walked into the room, and sitting down, leaned his arms on his knees, and stared before him indifferently, and yet, as I felt, with intense emotion of some kind.

"Lifton!" I gasped, "if you don't tell me what ails you, I shall go distracted."

He looked up, met my eyes, and woke from his trance of despair.

In the end this special love affair comes right. Esther hears the truth about Mlle. de Laurence; acknowledges that she has loved Lifton Darwin from the first; forgives him his delay and uncertainty of mind; and the curtain falls on that special drama in the good old way of the bridal wreath and the hymeneal altar.

Poor Aldyth is not so happy. Jack Ferriers comes back, and he and Aldyth are to be married; he apparently as much in love with her as ever, she as devoted, as tender, as faithful to him. But Philip, who loves Aldyth with the whole strength of his being, is not satisfied; as he says emphatically, "John Ferriers had a weak will." Having this weak will, he yields to the temptation of Caroline's beauty and inconceivable baseness, and, on the eve of marrying Aldyth, elopes with her younger sister. In extenuation it must be said that it is Caroline herself who proposes to him, and who tells him that Aldyth cannot love, does not love, but that she can and does. In the beginning he treats her with compassion, and as his sister; but in the end they go off to Australia as man and wife, leaving Aldyth broken-hearted, but saintly and sweet to the last.

* *Aldyth; or, Let the End Try the Man.* By Jessie Fothergill, Author of "Healey." 2 vols. London: Henry S. King & Co. 1877.

We cannot praise the author for her catastrophe. It is too vile and base as regards the actors concerned, too puerile in its sacrifice of all dignity and honour to passion, to be interesting. We can only feel that Aldyth is well out of her marriage with such a weak-brained bumpkin as Jack Ferriers proves himself to be; and that Caroline's infamy is too great to enlist our sympathy either in its present success or its future punishment. We would also beg the author to reconsider her method of telling a story, and, above all, to study the art of dialogue to more purpose. *Aldyth* is crowded with dialogues that are not scenes, nor helps to the progress of the story, nor yet elucidations of character. More than half of them might be swept away with advantage; and when once the reader feels the ground to be encumbered with useless material, his interest is gravely shaken in the rest. Also, why coin such a clumsy word as "uncareweighed"? and what is "noiseless energy" in the midst of a conversation? Is speech noiseless? "So it is when one has toothache very badly" is a vulgar simile to come into the midst of a grave *résumé* of affairs; and if Miss Fothergill could but realize the irritation caused by the trivial and non-illustrative quotations with which she loads her pages, she would break through a habit which perhaps more than any other marks the inexperienced hand. Still, though we cannot praise *Aldyth* as a satisfactory work of art, we can recommend it as thoroughly safe reading; and, so far, it will have its success as it has its value.

KETTNER'S BOOK OF THE TABLE.*

THIS is an elegant, amusing, and really learned volume, evidently the work of a scholar, gastrophile, and habitual diner-out at the best tables. That he is a scholar we infer, not so much from his repeating the apocryphal story that Cadmus was a cook (a tradition dating no earlier than Athenæus and Nonnus, and not thought worthy of record by Dr. William Smith), or from his telling us that Achilles and Patroclus were "wonderful grill-cooks," as from his philological ingenuity in tracing the "unde derivata" of many of the puzzles of culinary nomenclature. Mixing up old and new, recipe, anecdote, "savoir faire," and legendary table-lore, he has made up a book which would entitle him to hold his own with Gouffé or Urban Dubois. It is just the book that a professed diner-out might do well to arm himself with before beginning his daily task, and, though it is too much of a medley to be recommended for the study of the English cook pure and simple, even such might be trusted to glean from it excellent practical hints.

Inasmuch as the book contains no less than five hundred pages, it is obvious that our review of it can give little more than a few selected general features. To some of these the preface gives a clue which may be conveniently followed up by the help of the alphabetical arrangement of the contents. Thus, *apropos* of soups, the author shows convincingly the essential identity of the ten soups which, with some trivial and accidental difference, figure in cookery books as *Julienne*, *Jardinière*, *à la Macedoine*, *à la Paysanne*, &c. &c. If there is a peculiarity in any one of these, it is that in the theory of the first-named there is a large bunch of wood-sorrel melted into the clear broth, or consommé, though in practice, because the stalks were unpalatable, threads of carrots and strips of celery, lettuce, leek, and onion have supplanted it. The name is traced back to the wood-sorrel, or original shamrock, through a curious ascent, in which the pious exclamation "Alleluia!" at the sight of this emblem of the Trinity is corrupted first into "Lujula," then into "Juliola," and then, on being introduced by Catharine of Medici's Italian cooks into France, into their own Frenchified name of "Julienne." The other nine names for the most part represent accidental differences of one and the same soup, suggested under circumstances where necessity is the mother of invention. A counter instance of poverty of nomenclature is the French "aspic," which deserves to be as current a joke as the English melted butter, and which our author traces to the old French word "espice," or spic, *i.e.* lavender or spikenard, a flavouring ingredient of sauces as far back as the Roman Empire, though it has now played the all-sufficing sauce the same trick as the vanished trefoil has done in the case of the *Julienne*. Littré's derivation of it from "aspic," because "cold as a snake" (why not because "pungent as a snake?") is obviously false; but the ubiquity of "aspic sauce" in bills of fare is discreditable to culinary invention. Sauce *allemande* and Sauce *poulette* are shown to be only attempts to improve on Holland sauce, and the *Blanquette* (p. 74) is very much the same thing. Sauce *Bordelaise* is only a variety of the Genevese sauce, with red Bordeaux, one or two chopped shallots, and a clove of crushed garlic, though, oddly enough, an *Entrecôte à la Bordelaise* does not mean a *rib steak* with this sauce, but a grilled *rib steak* served with a piece of cold *maitre-d'hôtel* butter and some chopped shallot (p. 80). One more bit of soup-lore relates to a popular and fashionable soup which has come to mean something quite different from what it meant in the seventeenth century, which was a soup of pigeons, quails, or small birds, or a soup with a ragoût in it. It usually now means what Littré defines it, a soup of crayfish, a *Bisque d'écrevisses*. Our author refers it to a class of words described as follows:—

The word is now employed exactly as we employ such words as marmalade,

wine, pomatum, oregant, saveloy. Marmalade is a conserve of quinces—we give the name to a conserve of oranges. Wine is the juice of the grape, but we speak of cowslip and gooseberry wine. Pomatum is a cosmetic of apples, and never now does apple enter into it. Oregant ought to be no other than barley-water; it is now made of almonds, without a grain of barley. Saveloy, from the French "cervelas," formerly "cervelat," is a sausage made of brains, and now there are no brains in it. Precisely in the same way bisque was a soup of wood pigeons (which are called *bisets* in La Varenne), and it is now never made of wood pigeons, and nearly always of crayfish.

It must have come, however, to this signification at least a century and a half ago; for on turning to Dr. King's *Art of Cookery* (inscribed to Queen Anne's culinary physician, Dr. Lister) we find the lines:—

A prince who in a forest rides astray,
And weary to some cottage finds the way,
Talks of no pyramids of fowl or bisques of fish,
But hungry sups his cream served up in earthen dish.

Nowhere in the literature of the kitchen have we found so much evidence as here of the misnomers, non-sequiturs, and mislocations, so to speak, of particular dishes. The Irish stew, says our author, must owe its name either to its being unknown in Ireland, or else to the redundancy of potatoes in it. Covered, as in Scotland, over and above the potatoes with a crust, it becomes, with a slight change, the "Shepherd's pie"; and in Devon and Cornwall, with apples and onions instead of potatoes, and even of pork instead of mutton, the savoury mess reappears in the famous disguise of "Squab pye." Again, the modern "Albert pudding," as the Welshman knows, figured with credit as a Snowdon pudding at Beddgelert and Llanberis before the Prince Consort was born; though royal associations may have had something to do with the geometrical figures on the mould which remind us rather of South Kensington than of North Wales. The poultry fancier, as well as the epicure, would be indignant if told at this time of day that the *Rouen* duck is simply the *roan* duck, which in civilization retains the plumage of the wild-duck. *Apropos* of ducks, our author attributes the disesteem for roast duck in France, as contrasted with its high favour in England, to the fact that the French only half-roast them, and serve them underdone like the wild-duck. Gouffé allows but sixteen minutes.

As regards fish, it will surprise some of the uninitiated to know that a "brandade" of salt fish is so named from the old verb "brandir," to shake, from the process of shaking the stewpan very long until the whole of the naturally tough fish is metamorphosed into a thick cream, to be heaped into the dish with fried crusts around it. It will be easier to understand that the brill is inferior to the turbot, as lacking its gelatinous fins and skin. The char is pronounced the very best of all fish for a waterzoutje; but the plebeian "dab" would rise in fashionable esteem if he could but be rechristened "the Thames flounder." Under the head of Eels our author declares their breeding, increase, and fecundity to be a profound mystery; but Yarrell gives authority for believing them oviparous, producing their young like other true bony fish. A broiled eel done on a skewer is called a spitchooked eel (a corruption of "spitstick," *i.e.* en brochette), just as a "spatchcock" chicken is one that has been split open at the back, spread on a skewer, sprinkled with salt and pepper, rubbed with butter, and then grilled, the inside surface first taking the fire (119). We have heard it argued that "spatchcock" was an abbreviation of "despatch cock," because the fowl was hastily prepared; but the Kettner explanation is the true one. Amongst other fish we may tarry over the mullets, of which the grey cannot compare with the red, whose distinction is its liver, as that of the grey is the roe. It is this of which, when dried, salted, and prepared on the Mediterranean coast, is made a sausage called "Botargo," admired by toppers for the thirst it creates. The Scotch haddock should be salted inside and out after skinning. The hake is a coarse cod, of which it is an advantage that you can get out the backbone; and the ling is the largest of cods, the largest being best, though James I. did say that, if he asked the Devil to dinner, he would give him a ling's head. The halibut, a flatfish praised by Cowper, is nicknamed the "workhouse turbot"; and, *apropos* of herrings, it is a noteworthy question, If you do not eat the skins, why broil them? Mackerel is best served "split by the back, broiled, and served with maitre-d'hôtel butter." The English or Dutch cooking of fish is the simplest, and consequently the best for fresh fish. The French can make the most, however, of poor or stale fish with their reviving sauces. It is remarked that surface fish decay soon, and so want prompt cooking; while bottom fish, whether of sea or river, are tenacious of life, and keep some time out of water.

At the "Divitum mensæ" liqueurs rank as high in their way as fish, and the author's culinary alphabet begins with one—Absinthe, to wit, that most pernicious of liqueurs, which is made of wormwood or southernwood. The learning displayed hereupon, as also on angelica (whose synonyms might well be omitted), is a trifle flippant, not to say profane. Of the anisette of Bordeaux, with its mawkish sickly taste, it is justly remarked that it might be left among the medicine bottles of the nursery. *Acqua d'oro* is an Italian liquor imported into France by Catharine of Medici, and brought to realize the much-sought Aurum potable by putting into it chips of gold-leaf and rendering the liquid colourless. Its predominant flavour is rosemary, and its Italian origin assists the author to pooh-pooh Brillat Savarin's theory that liqueurs were invented to soothe Louis XIV.'s old age, and to show that the combination of spirits and perfumed syrups is of much earlier date. Amongst other liqueurs may be named the Chartreuse, of triple hue,

* *Kettner's Book of the Table: a Manual of Cookery, Practical, Theoretical, Historical.* London: Dulau & Co. 1877.

yellow, green, and white; Maraschino, a bitter-sweet liqueur made at Zara of the Marasca cherry kernels, and the Curaçoa of Holland, a liqueur of the very first class.

On the head of Fruits the author exhibits a laudable familiarity with our gardens and orchards. Witness his article on the apple, cooked and uncooked; his research as to the pearmain, where he is in accord with Dr. Hogg; and his calendar of the best fifty table and kitchen fruits in the order of their ripening and keeping. The peculiar virtue, he tells us, of a kitchen apple is its *souvenir* of Eden in the technical term "to fall." It is said to do so when, on being cooked, it forms a pulpy mass of equal consistence. Some of the dessert apples have this quality. The distinction, we learn, between "pies" and "tarts" is that the former are covered, the latter open. Among other hints for improving the flavour of an apple tart we miss the mention of cheese, which is not uncommonly eaten with it in the cider counties. On the apricot, cherry, plum, peach, and almond the reader will find much information, combined here and there with a dash of rhapsody, which is perhaps the writer's weak point. Speaking of the fondness of children for almonds and raisins, he absurdly describes this conjugation "as a fond union, happy pairs of brides and bridegrooms, entering into that rosy chamber of bliss—the pearl-barred mouth of a red-lipped child."

One good point in the volume is its alphabetical arrangement, which directs the reader at once to the information he needs. Armed with it he will discern at once between "croquettes, rissoles, and croquesquis"; he will understand how the filets of a supreme of chicken are *contised* ("inlaid with tongue or truffles"), and be familiar with braising and barding, as with boiling, roasting, or stewing. If he seeks a cheaply acquired acquaintance with the most renowned cooks, restaurateurs, or epicures, where can it be found more ready to hand than under B for Beauvilliers or Bechamel or Brillat Savarin, and C for Carême? Under the head of *Curry* our author says that it is not simply a stew with curry powder in it. One of its *differentia* is that it is eaten with a spoon and fork, and therefore cut or shred small. Further, it should have no accompaniment save rice. Don't eat it where your host offers you a potato withal. "That host has no garnish, onions, apple, cocoanut to his curry, or he would not overlay it with potatoes." Practical directions follow, showing how to make a Ceylon curry powder \approx Sand, and how to make a good curry. We have already spoken of the author's ingenuity in the matter of derivations. After once hearing it, shall we ever forget or doubt that the *fool* in gooseberry *fool* comes from the French "*fouler*" to crush? or that "*mayonnaise*" is derived not from "*Mahon*," a stronghold in the island of Minorca, but from the Provençal verb "*mahonner*," "to fatigue," or "*to mix a salad*"? Or take that harder philological puzzle, the *Dariole*, called on Richmond Hill "*a maid of honour*." It is English as old as Chaucer. The first syllables of *Dairy* and *Dariole* have been declared identical; but the link seems rather to be with the word "*da'i*," "*da*," or "*Daye*," which in Indian dialects and in the Northern dialects of Europe means a *nurse*, a *maid*, or a *milk-maid*. Mrs. Sherwood had a tale of *Lucy and her Daye* to match *Little Henry and his Bearer*. Thus we have the first syllable "*da*" or "*dey*," a *maid*, to prefix to *ryol*, or *ryal*, as the word was anciently spelt, and lo! *Daroyal*, the identical *maid of honour*.

The author's weakness is an itch for smartness and strained point. Where on earth is the cleverness of making the ingredients of the so-called *Financier's Relish* a text for impertinences after this fashion?—

It abounds in mushrooms to remind them of their upstart origin; in truffles, to signify by the fragrant fruits of earth-grubbing the precious results of money-grubbing; in cocks' combs emblematic of conceit; in quenelles, a delicate transformation of chicken, hinting at the transfiguring influence of wealth, and in collops of sweet bread to melt in the mouth and make the financier, though his heart be hard, feel the softness of life.

This may be smart, but is it common sense? If a capitalist gets rich and loves the pleasures of the table, or, more likely, loves his friends to enjoy the best he has to give them, why not? Is he to hoard his gains rather? We are reminded of a young poet for whose muse *indignatio fecit versum*, because the chariot wheels of a stock-jobber's madam splashed him in the park. Surely it is all fair, if paid for, and all good for trade. Smart writing, moreover, has its snares. Our author has fallen into one, in the case of good Dean Nowell (mentioned by Fuller in his *Worthies*), through eagerness to point an antithesis between spiritual *pabulum* and the discovery of bottled beer. The Dean was calmly perch-fishing, when Bishop Bonner and his emissaries were on the hue and cry to make a martyr of him; and on a hint of his danger, he fled in haste with bare time to hide a bottle of beer he had filled that morning. Anon, when the tyranny was overpast, the Dean returned to the Thames bank and his beer-bottle. On bringing it to the light of day, "it went off like a shot." It is no concern of ours to deny to Dean Nowell the invention of bottled beer; but when our author says that we are indebted to him for the Church Catechism, we may assure him that Dean Nowell's catechism ("*Christiane pietatis prima institutio ad usum scholarum Latine scripta*") is as different a thing from the Church Catechism as the bottle of beer which Dean Nowell had not time to drink with Bonner at his heels, from the same bottle when, on his return to his fishing nook in brighter times, it fizzed and almost blew his head off. We must not forget to mention that the author says one really good thing, though perhaps without knowing it. The volume is dedicated to "one of the most accomplished men of his time, the readiest of writers, the rarest of humourists, a most

winning orator, a most cunning draughtsman, laden with a learning which would crush most men, and blest with a heart which is almost that of a woman." It will be almost worth buying the book to learn who this Admirable Crichton can be. It would be hardly fair to forestall so interesting a revelation.

AMERICAN LITERATURE.

THE most important and interesting American works on our list for the present month are military histories of the War of Independence and the War of Secession. The former,* written by an officer of rank in the Federal army, describes in great detail all the battles of the revolutionary war from the skirmishes of Lexington and Concord to the surrender of Lord Cornwallis. It begins with several short chapters on military operations and on the particular characteristics of civil war. In one of these a distinction is drawn between insurrection, rebellion, and revolution, with which few readers who have ever thought on the subject will be inclined to agree. Every rebellion is an insurrection, and begins with insurrection, as defined by the author. Revolution is but the result of successful rebellion. The real distinction in the author's mind suggested by the circumstances of the war with which he deals, and by the remembrance of that subsequent struggle which every writer on the War of Independence is forced to keep in view and to compare with the rebellion which founded the United States, is the distinction between civil war such as that between King Charles I. and the Long Parliament—waged between two parties in the same nation, not separated generally by geographical lines but struggling for ascendancy over the whole country—and civil war, such as the wars of America, between a colony and the mother-country, or two geographically distinct portions of the same empire. If a war of the latter character breaks out between two sections of a State not very unequal in power and population, it has generally to be conducted more or less strictly as an international conflict. Both the war between England and her revolted colonies and that between the North and South were at a very early period regulated by the same principles and by the same usages and courtesies that belong to strife between independent nations. Though in each case the Government, claiming sovereignty over both parties, called its opponents rebels, and might at first have contemplated treating them as such, it was compelled very shortly to treat them practically as regular belligerents, to exchange prisoners, to send flags of truce, and thereby, in fact, if not in form, to recognize the existence of a rival Government entitled to the privileges of belligerency, though not to political independence. In each case the original Government bitterly resented the imitation of its own conduct by foreign Powers. The colonists succeeded in the war of 1776 because the foreign enemies of England interposed to assist her domestic foes; the Secessionists were crushed in the war of 1861 because European Powers forbore to render any sort of aid to the South. But Colonel Carrington, like nearly all American writers is bent on ignoring the strict analogy between the two cases; and, though he nowhere dwells at length upon the subject, his work, especially in its earlier chapters, contains a number of passages wherein facts and principles are wrested to show a distinction where there was in fact no difference. More important are the chapters which deal with the bearing of statesmanship and policy upon the conduct of war, and the principles of strategy and tactics; but the essential interest of the history lies in the minute accounts of each of the great campaigns in which the colonists maintained their claim to independence against the disciplined armies of Great Britain, and of each of the many battles in which discipline and technical military knowledge on the one hand were opposed to advantages of position, local knowledge, and generalship adapted to the peculiar conditions of the contest on the other. Washington and several of his officers had been trained in the Indian and French wars to just that sort of tactics and strategy which could best avail them in maintaining a prolonged struggle in a half-peopled and very much less than half-cultivated country against troops and generals educated only in the regular operations and formal tactics of European war. Not one of our chief commanders appears to have appreciated the entire difference in every important condition, and in the very nature both of the general conduct and detailed operations, between a struggle carried on among the fortified towns and rich closely-cultivated fields of Flanders, and one waged amid the forests, the unbridged rivers, and the scattered settlements of the American continent. The author's prejudices pervert his judgment on most, if not all, questions of military merit, and of the comparative advantages enjoyed by each contending party; but in his own despite he makes it clear enough that the English troops were far superior to their opponents in everything but individual courage, that the war must very speedily have terminated could the Americans have been brought to decide it in the open field, that they were enabled to prolong it by the impossibility of forcing them to decisive actions, or of pursuing and destroying a defeated force, and that its final issue was due less to the skill of Washington and his chief officers and the resolution of the Colonial troops than to the aid they received from France and the other European enemies of Great

* *Battles of the American Revolution, 1775-1781. Historical and Military Criticism; with Topographical Illustrations.* By Henry B. Carrington, M.A., LL.D., Colonel U.S.A. New York: Barnes & Co. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1876.

Britain. The careful and minutely detailed accounts of each movement and every important action, illustrated by careful plans and maps, render the work highly valuable for the purposes of a mere military history; and it will probably be a favourite with all critics and strategists interested in the peculiar kind of war of which it affords one of the most signal examples, and a useful text-book in military Colleges not only in England and America, but in every country whose soldiers are likely to be engaged in warfare in half-civilized and thinly-settled lands.

Dr. Mahan's account of the War of Secession* is much inferior to Colonel Carrington's both in merit and value. The author is a civilian with no military experience, but with a profound self-confidence and a belief in the superiority of his own plans to those of the best strategists and commanders his country can boast, which are likely to move the laughter rather than the admiration of military readers. We had thought that from a very early period experience had satisfied every one, save Mr. Seward himself, of the exceeding absurdity of his repeated promises to end the struggle in three months; but Dr. Mahan remains of opinion that, if he himself had been allowed to direct the movements of the American armies, to dictate the operations of McClellan in Virginia, of Grant, Rosecrantz, Buell, and the other Federal commanders in the West, the Southern armies must have been crushed within the period prescribed by the sanguine promises of the Secretary of State. On one single point we may admit him to be right. We believe that few military judges of authority consider General McDowell in any wise responsible for the initial disaster of Manassas, which exercised so material an influence over the whole history of the war, and gave the South at the outset a respite and period of preparation which, if thoroughly well used, might have given her even greater advantages than she drew from it. It is notorious that McDowell had no staff, and that without a staff the best general would have been embarrassed even if commanding trained regular troops; while, with only two or three aides-de-camp, and with a thoroughly untrained army, it is rather surprising that he could move and act at all without falling into sheer confusion than that he should have been signally defeated in his first encounter with an enemy strongly posted on the defensive. Dr. Mahan, however, has not even discovered in the course of ten years' lecturing and studying what had become apparent to much less self-confident observers before the war had ended—that the critical and decisive operations were those of the fleet, the river flotillas, and the armies operating on the Ohio and Mississippi, rather than those of the grand Army of the Potomac. He still persists in the error, common to most of his fellow-civilians up to 1864, that the struggle in Virginia was the all-important feature of the contest, and blames the Federal Government and generals for dispersing their troops in order to penetrate the Confederacy in other directions and to establish themselves at important points on the coast, instead of concentrating their whole power in an attempt to seize the capital of the Confederacy. The truth is that, had Richmond fallen at an early period of the war, its fall might quite as probably have prolonged the struggle as have brought it to a speedy end. It was by the operations in the West, which first cut off from the Confederates the whole of their resources beyond the Mississippi, which next deprived them of Tennessee, Southern Mississippi, and Northern Alabama, and which finally cut off the main army in Virginia from the Gulf States by Sherman's march, rather than by those direct attacks in which the best troops and commanders of the Union were for four years constantly engaged and constantly defeated, that the South was conquered. The idea that General Grant, if placed in command at first, would have brought the war to a close by the end of 1861, is sufficiently refuted by a mere glance at the campaign which he did conduct after the Army of Virginia had been almost worn out by three years of hard fighting, and wasted by the desertions due to the havoc and terror spread by the Western invaders through the States from which a large part of Lee's soldiers came. Wielding a force of a quarter of a million against fewer than sixty thousand, General Grant was beaten in every pitched battle that he fought; and when General Lee was finally driven within the lines of Richmond and Petersburg, the general who controlled the whole forces of the North, and could dispose in Virginia of more than two hundred thousand soldiers, was kept at bay for six months by earthworks thirty miles in extent, and guarded by a force dwindling from forty-five to twenty-eight thousand men. Self-opinion so dogmatic, criticisms so arrogant, on the part of a civilian writer prevent the reader from placing any confidence in his views, or even in statements of fact not directly supported by documentary evidence obtained from military men.

A third work, entitled *The Boys of '76*†, gives a popular account of the Revolutionary war, here and there illustrated by the adventures and remarks of fictitious or traditional characters of minor importance, but mainly historical. In order to enliven his account, the author has resort to what he supposes to be graphic writing, but what is really wild exaggeration and description so imperfectly authenticated as constantly to provoke disbelief on the part of a thoughtful reader.

* *A Critical History of the late American War.* By A. Mahan. With an Introductory Letter by Lieutenant-General M. W. Smith. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1877.

† *The Boys of '76: a History of the Battles of the Revolution.* By Charles Carleton Coffin, Author of "My Days and Nights on the Battlefield," &c. Illustrated. New York: Harper Brothers. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1876.

Political economy as a science is but little studied in America; comparatively few of her active politicians, and a minority even of her most influential statesmen, appear to possess such a knowledge of the elementary and unquestioned principles of that science as is necessary to give point and value to their arguments on disputed issues. Nevertheless there are many economists in the States perfectly familiar with their subject, and capable of stating its principles either with scientific precision or in a clear and simple form intelligible to every reader of ordinary education, and with a cogency which might, one would think, serve to dispel some at least of the wilder delusions which still affect the policy and legislation of the country, and possess a strong hold upon large numbers of men in other respects thoroughly practical and reasonable. The little volume before us* entitled *An Alphabet in Finance* deals vigorously and plainly with those principles of monetary science which have been so signally disregarded in Federal legislation since the beginning of the Civil War, and which have but lately obtained a partial recognition in the gradual victory of the "hard-money" sections both of the Republican and of the Democratic parties. The writer refutes very clearly the idea that paper money can have a value of its own, or can obtain one from the mere affixing to it of names borrowed from a metallic coinage. He points out also, what has been little observed by other economists, the inseparable connexion between the theory of the inflationists and the idea that the coin derives its value from the Government stamp and not from the intrinsic worth of the metal it contains. Any person who once recognizes the fact that the worth of a sovereign is precisely that of the gold whereof it is made, plus such minute seigniorage as may be charged by the mint without leading to unauthorized coinage, must perceive as a logical consequence that inconvertible paper-money can have no certain or permanent value, but must be depreciated exactly in proportion to the excess of its quantity above that of the metallic currency which it displaces. This is the main doctrine enforced in the able little work of Mr. McAdam, and it is demonstrated with a lucidity of reasoning and aptness of illustration peculiarly suited to a popular treatise on a practical but much mystified subject.

Though written by a gentleman of German name, these *Lectures on the History of Philosophy*† are American, and were addressed in the English language to the scholars of an American college. The outlines are too meagre to render the work interesting or useful to private students; indeed it mainly consists of a list of eminent names, with bare sketches of the principal views held by each; and in the course of less than three hundred pages it deals, after a fashion, with all the different schools and systems of philosophy, from those whose elements are found in the Vedas, and from the Pythagoreans and other pre-Socratic speculators of Greece, down to Coleridge, Hamilton, Mill, Cousin, and other eminent metaphysicians of the present century.

Apparently belonging to a series of popular treatises on natural history, of which, however, we do not remember to have seen any previous volumes, is a very interesting and practical work on entomology, entitled *Half-hours with Insects*, by Mr. A. S. Packard.‡ The method of treatment and the arrangement of subjects are convenient and attractive. The author begins with a chapter on the insects of the garden, describing those with which even children may render themselves familiar, and which, either as pests or as serviceable friends of the gardener, are known by name at least to most residents in the country. He proceeds with an account of the relation of insects to man, describing especially those by which man is especially liable to be annoyed or injured, and, among them, the parasites which vex his body, and the common insects by which children and husbandmen are liable to be bitten or stung. He proceeds with the insects of the plant-house, those of the pond and stream, and those of the field, among which the grasshopper is the most familiar, the army worm, which destroys so large a part of the cotton crop in adverse years, and the potato beetle of Colorado, probably the most important. Finally, he describes some of the more remarkable habits of the insect creation, in chapters on the mimicry and architecture of different species; and winds up with chapters on their social life and mental powers, which, while intelligible to very young readers, are worthy of the attention of all but thorough entomologists.

Busk's *Roman Legends*§ are not what this title will lead the public generally to expect. They have no relation to the tale of Romulus and Remus, to the traditions of the Roman kings, or to those stories, probably originating in antique Latin ballads, which form so large a part of the History of Livy, and some of which have attained so wide a popularity when restored to their old ballad form by the genius of Macaulay. These so-called legends really consist of the fables and folk-lore of modern Rome; some of them of course more or less closely related to those fairy tales and fables which, in one form or another, are the common heritage either of the whole Aryan race or of the great Teutonic family;

* *An Alphabet in Finance.* By Graham McAdam. New York: Putnam's Sons. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1876.

† *Outlines of Lectures on the History of Philosophy.* By John J. Elmendorf, S.T.D., University Professor of Philosophy and English Literature in Racine College. New York: Putnam's Sons. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1876.

‡ *Half-hours with Insects.* By A. S. Packard, junior, Author of "A Guide to the Study of Insects," &c. Boston: Estes & Lauriat. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1877.

§ *Roman Legends: a Collection of the Fables and Folk-Lore of Rome.* By R. H. Busk, Author of "Sagas from the Far East," &c. Boston: Estes & Lauriat. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1877.

the latter having doubtless introduced much of its legendary lore as well as the principles of chivalry and of feudalism in the course of its many conquests and settlements in Italy. The reader will recognize "Cinderella," the "Yard of Nose," and not a few other familiar fragments of Northern folklore, scarcely disguised or modified in the present volume. Stories of the Saints and Apostles are often less familiar and more peculiarly Roman, and some of the ghost stories and local traditions will probably be entirely new to English readers. Altogether, the volume is likely to be exceedingly interesting to children both of a smaller and a larger growth, as well as to afford material for study to those who have some idea of the important bearings of comparative mythology, even in these its lower and simpler forms, on the early history of nations and the connexion of races.

Dr. H. M. Field's volume, *From the Lakes of Killarney to the Golden Horn**, contains many lively and amusing sketches of European life and scenery, architecture, and society, from an American point of view. A still larger part of the volume, a closely printed one, is filled with sociological and political reflections seldom marked by much originality of thought or thoroughness of knowledge, and always characterized by those strong Republican prejudices, sympathies, and antipathies which all American writers seem to think it needful to express, even when one can hardly suspect them of being really actuated by such utterly one-sided views; and marked also by the peculiar sectarian bias of the writer. The latter remark applies also to Mrs. Hauser's *Orient and its People*†, a collection of fragmentary sketches of Indian and Chinese towns, temples, and mosques, homes, and people, rendered interesting by the fact that the author has regarded them from a missionary point of view, but with less of mere missionary fanaticism than is common in works proceeding from the same class of writers. The reader may find here and there facts and observations which are new, or at least unfamiliar and tolerably significant, mixed with much that is old and trite, and much that is neither trustworthy nor valuable.

We have not yet done with the Centennial Exhibition. It has given rise to a "souvenir"‡ in the shape of a portfolio containing coloured sketches of the buildings in which the several States of the Union and foreign countries collected their respective contributions to the Philadelphia Exposition; and also to a history of its origin and achievements§, with a description of its principal features, prefaced by a sketchy account of the century of independence and progress whose conclusion the Exhibition was intended to celebrate—a work altogether more ambitious than either important or entertaining. The Centennial celebration also drew forth *Three Memorial Poems*¶ from Mr. Lowell, of that character which it was once the chief duty, and is still the least satisfactory office, of an English Laureate to furnish.

The Farmyard Club¶¶ is a collection of papers and conversations on various agricultural topics and other questions arising in rural life concerning the various arrangements and regulations of an American township, strung together by a thread of not very interesting or amusing fiction. The work might have been somewhat more convenient and attractive to those for whose use it is intended had it been put forward simply as a collection of papers on husbandry. It might then have been cut down to a smaller bulk, and yet contained everything which can be useful or acceptable to its readers.

A work entitled *Mothers and Daughters*** contains much information, and not a little sound advice, such as medical writers of more weight and authority than Dr. Verdi have thought it necessary to give to American ladies regarding the physical and mental training of the rising generation of their sex under the peculiar conditions of American life. In the Northern States, at least, the health of girls, especially in the well-to-do classes, is endangered by two causes not often combined—by exposure to excessive intellectual stimulus, leading to mental over-exertion at a critical period of life, and also by a far too early introduction to society, under conditions of independence which render the temptations of excitement and dissipation more formidable than in countries where female youth is more closely watched and more strictly controlled. We cannot enter into any of the details with which the volume deals, nor do we know that its advice is much needed by English mothers except in a certain limited set; but, from all we have heard and read of American life, especially in the great cities of the North, we can readily conceive that it is but too much needed there.

Of fiction we have an unusually ample supply, especially of that

* *From the Lakes of Killarney to the Golden Horn*. By Henry M. Field, D.D. New York: Scribner, Armstrong, & Co. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1877.

† *The Orient and its People*. By Mrs. J. L. Hauser. Milwaukee: Hauser & Co. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1876.

‡ *The Centennial Portfolio: a Souvenir of the International Exhibition at Philadelphia; comprising Lithographic Views of Fifty of its Principal Buildings, with Letterpress Descriptions*. By James Westcott. Philadelphia: T. Hunter. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1876.

§ *The Century: its Fruits and its Festival: a History and Description of the Centennial Exhibition*. By E. C. Bruce. Illustrated. Philadelphia: Lippincott & Co. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1877.

¶ *Three Memorial Poems*. By James Russell Lowell. Boston: Osgood & Co. London: Trübner & Co. 1877.

¶¶ *The Farmyard Club of Jotham: an Account of the Families and Farms of that Famous Town*. By George B. Loring. Illustrated. Boston: Lockwood, Brooks, & Co. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1866.

** *Mothers and Daughters: Practical Studies for the Conservation of the Health of Girls*. By T. S. Verdi, A.M., Author of "Maternity," &c. New York: Ford & Co. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1877.

class of stories of adventure and youthful experience of which the American press is not less prolific than our own, and in which, despite their premature emancipation, American boys and girls apparently delight as heartily as their English kinsfolk. Mr. Adeler's *Elbow Room** endeavours to make up for the absence of what is generally considered essential to a novel—a plot—by a variety of comic conversations and farcical incidents, which may move a laugh among those who find modern comedy amusing and modern farce laughable. *Frank in the Forecastle*† is one of those sea tales which are always especially delightful to boys. *Shifting for Himself*‡, *The Boy Emigrants*§, *The Trail Hunters*|| illustrate various phases of boy life, actual or conceivable, in a new country. *Student Life at Harvard*¶ is a sketch of an American University in somewhat less outrageous taste than those which have caricatured the more noisy and less respectable side of Oxford and Cambridge for the amusement of English lads. *Snip and Whip*** and *The House with Spectacles*†† are ordinary boys' stories. *An Average Boy's Vacation*‡‡ is thoroughly harmless, and more than usually readable. "Young America Abroad"§§ is meant to combine amusement with geographical, political, and historical instruction; a combination which seldom satisfies the taste of those for whose benefit it is intended.

* *Elbow Room: a Novel without a Plot*. By Matt Adeler. Illustrated by Arthur B. Frost. Philadelphia: Stoddart & Co. London: Sampson Low & Co.

† *Frank in the Forecastle*. By Harry Castleman, Author of "The Sportsman's Club" Series, &c. Philadelphia: Porter & Coates. London: Sampson Low & Co.

‡ *Shifting for Himself: or, Gilbert Greyson's Fortunes*. By Horatio Alger, Jun., Author of "Ragged Dick" Series, &c. Boston: Loring. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1877.

§ *The Boy Emigrants*. By Noah Brooks. Illustrated. New York: Scribner, Armstrong, & Co. London: Sampson Low & Co.

|| *The Young Trail Hunters*. By Samuel Woodworth Cozzens. Illustrated. Boston: Lee & Shepard. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1877.

¶ *Student Life at Harvard*. Boston: Lockwood, Brooks, & Co. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1876.

** *Snip and Whip, and Some Other Boys*. By Elizabeth A. Davis. Illustrated. Boston: Lee & Shepard. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1877.

†† *The House with Spectacles*. By Leoro Betteson Robinson. New York: Putnam's Sons. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1877.

‡‡ *An Average Boy's Vacation*. By Mary S. Deering. Portland: Dresser, McEllan, & Co. London: Sampson Low & Co.

§§ *Vine and Olive; or, Young America in Spain and Portugal*. By William T. Adams, Author of "Outward Bound," &c. Boston: Lee & Shepard. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1876.

NOTICE.

We beg leave to state that we decline to return rejected Communications; and to this rule we can make no exception.

PARIS.

Copies of the SATURDAY REVIEW may be obtained every Saturday of M. FOTHERINGHAM, 8 Rue Neuve des Capucines.

The publication of the SATURDAY REVIEW takes place on Saturday Mornings, in time for the early trains, and copies may be obtained in the Country, through any Newsagent, on the day of publication.

THE SATURDAY REVIEW

OF

POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

Price 6d.

CONTENTS OF No. 1,113, FEBRUARY 24, 1877:

The Eastern Question in the Lords. Germany.
The Unfinished Debate. The American Presidency. English Doctors in France.
The Wilton Election. The Free Fight on the Metropolitan Railway.
Discipline in the Merchant Service. Our Halfpenny Oracle.

Proposed Resumption of the Vatican Council.

The Lessons of a Lady Help.
Duelling in France. Federalism and Dualism. French Impressions of London.
Utilization of the Depot Centres. Dean Stanley and Sir Roger de Coverley.
Lord Penance's Salary. St. Martin's Portico.

Wallace's Russia. Cochrane's Historic Châteaux.
Spencer's Principles of Sociology—II. The Makers of Florence.
The Scotts of Scot's Hall. Bronzes in South Kensington Museum. Aldyth.
Kettner's Book of the Table. American Literature.

CONTENTS OF No. 1,112, FEBRUARY 17, 1877:

The Turkish Blue—Treaty Obligations of 1856—The Prisons Bill—Lord Derby on Extradition—Austria and Hungary—Miscellaneous Legislation—The Famine and the Government of India—The Railway Accidents Commission.

Cleopatra's Needle—International Phonetics—St. Valentine—Whitechapel Church—The Liebon Tramways Company—Papal Rome and Italian Rome—Sentimental Showmen—Reorganisation of the Irish Law Courts—The Theatres.

Rowley's Rise of the People—Life of Titian—The Dialect of Mid-Yorkshire—The Cruise of the Challenger—The Formation of the Greek and Latin Languages—A Family Party in the Piazza of St. Peter—Dennis's Studies in English Literature—Lettres inédites de Madame de Sévigné—The Savage Life—German Literature.

London: Published at 38 SOUTHAMPTON STREET, STRAND, W.C.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

MR. WALTER BACHE'S THIRTEENTH ANNUAL

CONCERT, St. James's Hall, Tuesday, Feb. 27, at Half-past Eight o'clock. List's symphonic poem "Maseppa" (first performed at the Crystal Palace) by increased Orchestra of ninety performers. Principal Violin, Mr. Deichmann; Conductor, Mr. August Manns. Repetition of "Les Pêcheurs" (List's Lory). Vocalist, Mrs. Osgood; Pianoforte Concerto, by Chopin (P. Minor) and List (A. Major). Pianoforte, Stalla, 10s. 6d. Reserved Area, 5s.; Balcony, 3s.; Admission, 1s. Tickets may be obtained of Stanley Lucas, Weber & Co., 54 New Bond Street, usual Agents, and Austin's Ticket Office, St. James's Hall.

THE SOCIETY OF PAINTERS in WATER COLOURS.—

The FIFTEENTH WINTER EXHIBITION OF SKETCHES AND STUDIES will CLOSE on Saturday, March 10. 5 Pall Mall East. Ten till Five. Admission 1s.

ALFRED D. FRIPP, Secretary.

DORÉ'S GREAT WORKS, "CHRIST LEAVING the PRÆTORIUM," and "CHRIST ENTERING JERUSALEM" (the latter just completed), each 30 by 22 feet; with "Dream of Pilate's Wife," "Christian Martyrs," &c. &c., at the DORÉ GALLERY, 35 New Bond Street. Daily, Ten to Six. 1s.

MR. MARTIN COLNAGHI'S WINTER EXHIBITION

PICTURES, by Domingo, Roybet, Tapiro, Israel, Rosa Bonheur, De Nittis, Bianchi Rocca, Williams, Stevens, &c. &c. Open Daily. Admission, 1s., including Catalogue.—GUARDI GALLERY, 11 Haymarket.

COMMEMORATION FESTIVAL.

ORPHAN WORKING SCHOOL, Haverstock Hill, Hornsey Rise, and Margate.—The Committee have the honour of announcing that L.R.H. the PRINCE OF WALES has graciously consented to PRESIDE at the 116th ANNIVERSARY FESTIVAL, on Monday, March 5, at Willie's Rooms, King Street, St. James's, to commemorate the amalgamation of the Alexandrian Orphanage with the Orphan Working School. Noblemen and Gentlemen desirous of becoming Stewards on the occasion are kindly requested to intimate the same to

Office, 73 Cheapside. JONADAB FINCH, Secretary.

SECRETARY.—UNIVERSITY COLLEGE HOSPITAL.—

A GENTLEMAN is required to fill the office of SECRETARY to the Hospital, the appointment to which rests with the Council of the College. It is desirable that he should possess experience in the management of the affairs of a Public Charity, and a competent knowledge of Accounts.—For further information apply, by letter only, to the SECRETARY, University College, London, W.C., to whom applications, including a statement of age and testimonials, are to be forwarded on or before March 15.

TALFOURD ELY, M.A., Secretary to the Council of University College, London.

LONDON UNIVERSITY MATRICULATION.—Examination

in June. APOTHECARIES' HALL in April. COLLEGE OF SURGEONS in September. Careful and Effective Preparation for these Examinations by a Staff of University Graduates.—Address, M. LALING, M.A., 9 Flaxman Buildings, Temple, E.C.

RADLEY COLLEGE.—AN ELECTION TO FOUR

ENTRANCE SCHOLARSHIPS. Two of the annual value of £50 each. One of £20, and One of £30, all tenable for Four Years, will be held after the Easter holidays.—Apply to the BURSAR, Radley College, Abingdon.

CLIFTON COLLEGE SCHOLARSHIPS.—

NINE or more will be open to competition at Midsummer 1877, value from £25 to £50 a year, which may be increased from a special fund to £200 a year in case of Scholars who require it.—Further particulars may be obtained of the HEAD-MASTER or SECRETARY, the College, Clifton, Bristol.

SCHOLARSHIPS.—ALDENHAM GRAMMAR SCHOOL,

near Watford, Herts.—An EXAMINATION will be held on March 20 and 31 for THREE ENTRANCE SCHOLARSHIPS of the average annual value of £20. Open to Boys under Fourteen. For particulars apply to J. KENNEDY, M.A., Head-Master.

ST. PETER'S SCHOOL, YORK.—

Head-Master.—Rev. H. M. STEPHENSON, M.A., late Fellow of Christ College, Cambridge; assisted by eight Graduates of English Universities, besides Modern Languages, Drawing and Music Masters.

This School, which consists of Classical and Modern Departments, prepares BOYS for Universities, Professions, and Commercial Life.

Two Scholarships of the value of £4 and Two of the value of 13 Guineas per annum are given away by examination every year to Boys under Fifteen years of age who have been one year in the School. An Exhibition, value £50 per annum, is also given every year, tenable for three years, at an English University.

The Pupils of this School are also eligible to the Hastings Exhibitions, at Queen's College, Oxford, value £30 per annum.

Terms: Board, &c., 54 Guineas; Tuition, 13 or 11 Guineas, according to age.

EDUCATION (Private, High-class) in GERMANY, with the

unusual advantages of the Royal Colleges, attended by the Sons of the Crown-Prince of Germany. Thorough French and German by resident Graduates, and a refined English home.—Address, Dr. SAUER, M.A., Cassel; who will be at the Langham Hotel at Easter.

FOLKESTONE.—MR. W. J. JEAFFRESON, M.A. (Scholar)

Oxon., assisted by a Cambridge Honourman and a competent staff of Teachers, prepares for the Universities and for all Competitive Examinations. Pupils successful at the last Nine Examinations of the Line.

HIGHCLERE, NEWBURY.—The Rev. E. T. WATERS,

M.A., of Worcester College, Oxford, prepares BOYS between Seven and Twelve years of age for the Public Schools. A resident French and German Governor. Vacancies after Easter. Reference kindly permitted to the Earl of Carnarvon, 16 Bruton Street, W.—Address, Highclere Rectory, Newbury, Berks.

WOOLWICH, ARMY DIRECT, COOPER'S HILL, and

CIVIL SERVICE.—A CAMBRIDGE WRANGLER, who has passed 300, prepares TWELVE PUPILS only. High-Class assistance.—Rev. Dr. HUGHES, Ealing, W.

THE Rev. J. S. CATTLOW, late Fellow and Tutor of St.

John's Coll., Oxford, will take a PUPIL to prepare for any Examination. Superior opportunities for acquiring French, German, and Drawing in all its branches. A Candidate for Ordination would be taken.—Framlingham, Suffolk.

FRIAR PARK, HENLEY-ON-THAMES.

Half a mile from the Station.—The Rev. J. M. COLLARD, M.A., of St. John's College, Cambridge, will take a PUPIL to prepare for any Examination. Superior opportunities for acquiring French, German, and Drawing in all its branches. A Candidate for Ordination would be taken.—Framlingham, Suffolk.

RISLEY ENDOWED SCHOOL, DERBYSHIRE.—

WANTED, a HEAD-MASTER, to enter on his duties on May 1. A Member of the Church of England, and a Graduate of one of the English Universities. He must give a Religious, Classical, Mathematical, and Commercial Education. Salary, £140 per annum, exclusive of a good House, Orchard, and Garden. He may take a limited number of Boarders. Testimonials to be sent under cover, on or before March 5 next, to Mr. JOHN STEVENS, Draycott, Derby.—Candidates are requested not to make a personal application to the Trustees.

ADVOWNS and NEXT PRESENTATIONS.—The

GRADUATE SOCIETY, 455 West Strand, transact every kind of Clerical Business with promptitude. Incumbents furnished with University Courses. Curates are invited to make their wishes known to the SECRETARY.

PRIVATE LIBRARIES, and those of Colleges and Literary

and Scientific Institutions, CATALOGUED and ARRANGED by W. H. AYLOTT, Librarian. Reference will be given to parties by whom he has been engaged.—Address, 33 Cheapside, E.C.

NOTICE OF REMOVAL.—MR. F. E. HINE, Dealer in Works

of Art, has REMOVED his Business from 3 Piccadilly, W., to 27 KING STREET, St. James's Square, S.W.

HYDROPATHY.—SUDBROOK PARK, Richmond Hill

Physician, Dr. EDWARD LANE, M.A., M.D. Edin. For Invalids and those requiring rest and change. Turkish Bath on the premises. Private entrance to Richmond Park.

BEN RHYDDING HYDROPATHIC ESTABLISHMENT

and SANATORIUM, WHARFEDALE.

SPECIAL WINTER TERMS.

For particulars address the MANAGER, Ben Rhydding, near Leeds.

OVERLAND ROUTE and SUEZ CANAL.—

Under Contract for the conveyance of the Mails to the Mediterranean, India, China, Japan, and Australia. The Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company despatch their Steamers from Southampton, via the Suez Canal, every Thursday, from Venice every Friday, and from Brindisi, with the Overland Mail, every Monday.

Offices, 172 Leadenhall Street, E.C., and 25 Cockspur Street, S.W.

HOTELS.

BRIGHTON.—BEDFORD HOTEL.—Facing Sea and

Esplanade. Near the West Pier. Central and quiet. Long established. Suites of Rooms. Spacious Coffee-room for Ladies and Gentlemen. Sea-Water Service in the Hotel.

F. O. RICKARDS, Manager.

THE GRANVILLE PRIVATE SPECIAL EXPRESS

TRAINS TO ST. LAWRENCE-ON-SEA, near RAMSGATE, in TWO HOURS. Departures every Friday, from Charing Cross, at 3.45, and Cannon Street, 3.50 P.M. (See Bill).

"THE GRANVILLE."

"Nowhere in England can a series of Baths, such as that at the Granville, be seen." "As a residential hotel during winter, the Granville is second to none."—*Globe*.

Address the MANAGER, Granville Hotel, St. Lawrence-on-Sea, Ramsgate.

OLD ARTIFICIAL TEETH BOUGHT.—Persons having

any to SELL can apply, or if sent by post their value will be sent per return.—Messrs. BROWNE, Manufacturing Dentists, 37 Ebury Street, near Victoria Station, London; and 4th Ship Street, Brighton, "the only purchasers of Old Teeth." Established 25 years.

THE ASTRONOMER-ROYAL Reported to the Admiralty

(August 13, 1870) on 40 Chronometers entered for annual competition. "M. F. DENT'S is the best we have ever had on trial."—M. F. DENT, Chronometer, Watch, and Clock Maker to the Queen, 33 COCKSPUR STREET, CHARING CROSS.

WILLIAM S. BURTON, 39 Oxford Street.

TABLE CUTLERY.	Table Knives.	Desert Knives.	Carvers.
The Blades are all of the finest Steel.	s. d.	s. d.	per Pair s. d.
3½-inch Ivory Handles..... per Dozen	14	14	" 6
3½ ditto ditto.....	15	15	" 7
3½ ditto ditto balance.....	20	20	" 8
3½ ditto ditto ditto.....	20	20	" 8
4 ditto ditto ditto.....	30	30	" 9
4 ditto fine ditto ditto.....	33	33	" 9 6
4 ditto ditto, extra large.....	36	36	" 10 6
4 ditto ditto, African.....	43	43	" 13 6
4 ditto Silver Ferules.....	43	43	" 15
4 ditto Silver Blades.....	49	49	" 17
4 ditto Electro-Silvered Handles.....	59	59	" 26

WILLIAM S. BURTON, General Furnishing Ironmonger, by appointment to H.R.H. the Prince of Wales, sends a CATALOGUE, post free, containing upwards of 800 Illustrations of his unrivalled Stock, with List of Prices and Plans of the Thirty large Show-rooms, 39 Oxford Street, W.; 1, 1A, 2, 3, and 4 Newman Street; 4, 5, and 6 Perry's Place; and 1 Newman Yard; Manufactories, 54 Newman Street; and Newman Works, London, W.

MORRIS & COMPANY'S

PAPER-HANGINGS,

PRINTED COTTON GOODS,

FURNITURE SILKS AND VELVETS,

TAPESTRIES,

FLOOR CLOTHS, AND CARPETS.

26 QUEEN SQUARE, BLOOMSBURY.

N.B.—No Paper-hangings or Printed Cottons are of MORRIS & COMPANY'S design unless their name appears on the margin of each piece.

FURNISH YOUR HOUSE or APARTMENTS

THROUGHOUT on MORRIS'S HIRE SYSTEM. The original, best, and most liberal. Cash Prices; no Extra Charge for time given. Large, useful Stock to select from. Illustrated price Catalogue, with Terms, post free.—218, 249, and 250 Tottenham Court Road. Established 1862.

CLARK'S PATENT STEEL NOISELESS SHUTTERS.

Self-Colling, Fire and Thief Proof, can be adapted to any Window or other Opening. Prospectuses free.—CLARK & CO., Sole Patentees, Rathbone Place, W.; Paris, Manchester, Liverpool, and Dublin.

CARTER'S NEW PATENT READING-EASEL, to cramp

to any chair. Will hold a book at any height, angle, or visual distance. Can be adjusted for Writing and Drawing in a reclining position. Very light and portable. Price 3s. Drawings free.—J. CARTER, 6A New Cavendish Street, Great Portland Street, W.

FOR the TOILET, the NURSERY, and for SHAVING.

Pure, Fragrant, and Durable.

PEAR'S TRANSPARENT SOAP

"Is an article of the nicest and most careful manufacture, and one of the most refreshing and agreeable of balms to the skin."

"JOURNAL OF CUTANEOUS MEDICINE," Edited by

MR. ERASMUS WILSON, F.R.S.

SOLD BY CHEMISTS AND PERFUMERS EVERYWHERE.

WILLS' BEST BIRD'S-EYE.

This TOBACCO is now put up in ONE OUNCE PACKETS, in addition to the other sizes, the Label being a reduced fac-simile of that used for the Two Ounce Packets.

W. D. & H. O. WILLS, Holborn Viaduct, London, E.C., and Bristol.

DELAY NOTICE.—The first Importation and Delivery of the

"Specialist" SAUMUR CHAMPAGNE is unavoidably deferred until March 5. The demand for this innocent and refreshing Wine (matchless of its class) has exceeded expectancy, but expedients are adopted to make certain the execution of all accumulative orders on the above-named day, after which date all orders will be promptly executed at 30s. per dozen. Carriage paid.

FELTOL & SONS (Sole Importers), Proprietors of the "Specialist" Sherry,

Albemarle Street, W.

and 5 Union Court, and 80 Bishopsgate Street, E.C.

KINAHAN'S LL WHISKY.

KINAHAN & CO., London, finding that, through the recommendation of the Medical Profession, the demand for their CELEBRATED OLD LL WHISKY for purely Medicinal Purposes is very great, submit with pleasure the following Analysis by Dr. A. H. HARRALL: "I have very carefully and fully analysed this well-known and popular Whisky. The samples were soft and mellow to the taste, aromatic and ethereal to the smell. The Whisky must be pronounced to be pure, well matured, and of very excellent quality. The Medical Profession may feel full confidence in the purity and quality of this Whisky."

"THE EXQUISITE APOLLINARIS—

A DELICIOUS BEVERAGE."

Dr. FOTHERGILL, Practitioner's Handbook, 1877.

APOLLINARIS and CHAMPAGNE FOR BALLS, DINNERS, SUPPERS, AND FESTIVITIES. London Prices, 50 quarts 26s., 100 pints 42s., bottles included. APOLLINARIS CO., LIM., 19 Regent St., S.W.

AMERICAN CENTENNIAL—PRIZE MEDAL.

FRY'S CARACAS COCOA.

"A most delicious and valuable article."—*Standard*.

"The Caracas Cocoa of each choice quality."—*Food, Water, and Air*, Edited by Dr. HARRALL.

TESTS INTERNATIONAL MEDAL awarded to J. S. FRY & SONS.